



THE INDIAN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. XXVII



CALCUTTA
1946

CONTENTS

	PAGE
• Cirañjīva and his patron Yāsavanta Sīmha ...	1
By Prof. Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharyya, M.A.	"
The Cālukyās of Kalyāṇi ...	11
By S. L. Katare, M.A.	"
The Talpurs of Sind ...	35
By Mohammad Yasin, M.A.	"
The North-West Frontier of the Sukanate during the 13th century	59
By U. N. Day, M.A.	"
Somatism of Vedic Psychology ...	70
By Dr. R. N. Dandekar, M.A., Ph.D.	"
Defence of Patna against the apprehended Pindari Incursion of 1812 ...	77
By Prof. Kalipada Mitra, M.A.	"
Guṇapatakā ...	82
By P. K. Gode, M.A.	"

Miscellany:

The Māluta Jātaka in Folk-lore ..	87
By Vasudeva S. Agrawala, M.A.	"
A Linguistic Note on the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad	89
By Mm. Prof. Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya	"
The Muslim Conquest of Bengal ..	92
By Prof. N. B. Roy, M.A.	"
Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya's economic Policy ..	97
By Y. Venkataramana, M.A.	"
Epithets of an Arhat in the Divyāvadāna ..	104
By Dr. E. J. Thomas, M.A., D.Lit.	"
Date of the earliest Sanskrit Inscription of Campā ...	107
By Dr. Dines Chandra Sircar, M.A., Ph.D.	"
The Vatsagulma Copper-plate Grant of King Vindhyaśakti II ...	110
By Dr. Dines Chandra Sircar, M.A., Ph.D.	"
Date of the Kalacuri Kakkala I ...	117
By Khushal Chandra Vatsalya Jain, M.A.	"

	PAGE
The Sūtrasamuccaya	121
By Anukulchandra Banerjee, M.A.	
The Fourth Session of the Indian History Congress, Lahore, 1940	127
By Dr. Dines Chandra Sircar, M.A., Ph.D.	
Reviews:	
Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture	131
By Dr. P. C. Bagchi, M.A., Lit.D.	
Sources of Kariṇātaka History, Vol. I	133
By Dr. D. C. Sircar, M.A., Ph.D.*	
Warren Hastings and Oudh	134
By S. K. Datta, M.A. (Oxon), Bar-at-Law	
Select Contents of Oriental Journals:	137

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Abhidhamma Abhivāyana	291
By Miss I. B. Horner, M.A.	
Revival of Maratha Power in the North	311
By Anil Chandra Banerjee, M.A.	
Some Anglo-French Disputes in Bengal during Post-Diwany Period ...	324
By Dr. Nandalal Chatterji, M.A., PH.D., D.LITT.	
A critical Study of Kalyan Singh's Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh ...	340
By Prof. S. H. Askari, M.A., B.L.	
Nāndī in Theory	359
By Miss Urmila Dave, M.A.	
The Ten Incarnations of Viṣṇu in Bengal	370
By Miss Kamala Ray, M.A.	
Miscellany :	
Firuz Shah Tughluq as a Ruler	386
By Dr. K. K. Basu, M.A., PH.D.	
Bhoganātha—a Poet of the 14th century	393
By M. P. L. Sastry, M.A.	
Reviews:	
Annual Report of the Archæological Survey of Mysore, 1938, 1939 ...	398
By Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, M.A., PH.D.	
Sāwanihāt-i-Mumtaz	400
Early Career of Kanhoji Angria and Other Papers	401
Jenghiz Khan	402
By A. C. Banerjee, M.A.	
Bussy in the Deccan	402
By Kasim Ali Sajan Lal, M.A.	
The Vān-Maṇḍana-Guṇa-Dūta-Kāvya	403
The Candra-Dūta-Kāvya	404
By Dr. Amareswar Thakur, M.A., PH.D.	
Haidar Ali	405
By I. Banerjee, M.A.	

	PAGE
The Archæology in Gujarat	405
By A. S. Gadre, M.A.	
Select Contents of Oriental Journals:	408
Supplement:	
Bhojarāja-Saccarita Nāṭaka	1-27

Plate:

Bhojarāja-Saccarita Nāṭaka, India Office Mss.

Facing P. 1 (Supplement)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Dramas ascribed to Bhāsa	415
By Dr. S. K. De, M.A., D.LIT.	
Origins of the Rajput War (1679-81)	430
By Yashpal, M.A.	
Bṛhaspati Rāyamukūṭa and his Patron as known from the former's works	442
By Dr. R. C. Hazra, M.A., PH.D.	
Date and Works of Rāyamukūṭa	456
By Prof. Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharyya, M.A.	
The Aṅgacūlyā, a sacred text of the Jains ...	472
By Dr. Amulyachandra Sen, M.A., D.PHIL.	
Position of Wives other than the first in the Vedic Rituals	492
By Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri, PH.D.	
Miscellany:	
Two religious Poems (in Marathi and Sanskrit) on the Hindu Nose-Ornaments	506
By P. K. Gode, M.A.	
A Prākṛit Grammar attributed to Samantabhadra ..	511
By Dr. A. N. Upadhye, M.A., D.LIT.	
Meghasandēśa—a note	517
By Prof. K. R. Pisharoti, M.A.	
A note on the Authorship of Āśvalāyana-grhya-mantra-vyākhyā	518
By M. Lakshminarasimhaiah, M.A.	
Reviews:	
History of Madras	524
By S. K. Dutt, M.A., BAR-AT-LAW	
The Din-i-Ilahi	525
By A. C. Banerjee, M.A.	
Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacaritra, vol. II	526
Auṇādikapadārṇava of Perusūrī	527
By Prof. Chintaharan Chakravarti, M.A.	
The Number of Rasas	528
By Dr. Manomohan Ghosh, M.A., PH.D.	

	PAGE
Sanskrit Poetesses, part A	529
By Dr. Amareswar Thakur, M.A., PH.D.	
Select Contents of Oriental Journals: . . .	530
Bibliographical Notes:	539
Supplement:	
Vratakālaviveka of Śūlapāṇi	1—27
By Suresh Chandra Banerji, M.A.	

The Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. XXVII

March, 1946

No. 1

Cirañjīva and his patron Yaśavanta Siṃha

Cirañjīva Bhaṭṭācārya, the celebrated poet and poetician of Bengal, was a prolific writer. Four of his works have hitherto been discovered and published:—the *Vidvanmoda-taraṅgiṇi*, the *Mādhavacampū*, the *Vṛttaratnāvali* and the *Kāvyaṇilāsa*. In the last named book the author has cited verses from three other works of himself viz. *Śṛṅgārataṭiṇi*, (*Hṛdaya*-) *Kalpalatā* and the *Sivastotra*, none of which has yet been discovered. Mss. of a work named *Tājīkaratna* by Cirañjīva Bhaṭṭācārya are reported,² but it is not clear if the two authors are identical, though it is not improbable that Cirañjīva, being the grandson of a Sāmudrakācārya, might have written a work on astrology.

A great confusion prevails regarding his date and the identification of his patron Yaśavanta Siṃha. Fortunately, Cirañjīva has

1 The *Vidvanmodataraṅgiṇi* has been printed many times: an edition with a Bengali translation appeared as early as 1826 A.D. (B. N. Banerji: *Samvāda-patre Sekālera Kathā*, 1st ed., pt. I, pp. 65-6) The *Mādhavacampū* was published by S. Sāmasrami in the *Pratnakarma-nandini* in 1871 A.D. The *Vṛttaratnāvali* was printed at Serampore in 1755 Śaka (1833 A.D.) along with the *Chandomañjarī* bound together. The *Kāvyaṇilāsa* has been published in the *Saraswati Bhavana* Texts in 1925 with an excellent Intro. by B. N. Sarma, M.A.

2 A fragment of the *Tājīkaratna* (fol. 5) exists in the *Saraswati Bhavana* Library of the Benares Sanskrit College: *Cat. of Sans. Mss.*, 1913, No. 2075. Another copy, dated 1607 Śaka, exists in the Library of the Sanskrit Sahitya Parisad, Calcutta, which we are unable to examine yet. In the *Vidvanmodataraṅgiṇi* (I. 6) Cirañjīva referred to his grandfather's proficiency in Palmistry.

recorded interesting details about himself and his family. His father Rāghavendra entitled Śatāvadhāna Bhaṭṭācārya was a student of the celebrated Naiyāyika of Navadvīpa Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgiśa, whose period of activity roughly extends over the last half of the 16th century A.D.³ Cirañjīva has preserved the names of his two literary works, the *Mantrārtha-dīpa* and the *Rāmaprakāśa*, of which the former remains yet to be discovered. Of the two rival poets of Rāghavendra's time and locality, whose panegyrics upon him have also been fondly preserved by Cirañjīva, we would identify Viṣṇu with the grandfather of Bāṇeśvara Vidyālaṅkāra belonging to the same village.⁴ At the end of the *Mādhavacampū* Cirañjīva recorded important details about himself in the following verse:—

वाग्देवीवदनादनादिरचना-विन्यासदीव्यत्रव-
द्वीपप्राप्तजनैरनेकदिवसं वाराणसीवासिनः ।
विद्यासागरजागरोन्नतमतेर्भाव्या ममैषा कृति-
विद्वद्भिः कृपया कयापि सहसा मातृसर्गमुत्सृज्य तैः ॥⁵

From this we gather that he was born at Navadvīpa, apparently when his father was residing there as a teacher, and he was long a resident at Benares where he seems to have read with a scholar of the title of Vidyāsāgara. The *Mādhavacampū* was written when he was yet a boy as the concluding verse in each chapter of the book '*bālye kautukino*' proves. Verses from this book as well as the *Vidvan-modatarāṅgiṇī* are found cited in the *Kāvya-vilāsa*, which was apparently the last of his works as far as available. The *Vidvan-modatarāṅgiṇī* was written after the death of his father when

3 Bhavānanda undoubtedly preceded Jagadīśa as a comparison of their commentaries on *Anumānadidhiti* easily proves. Jagadīśa was already at the head of the seminaries of Navadvīpa in 1532 Śaka (1610 A.D.), as stated in a Ms. of his work we examined at Naihati in the family collection of the late Dr. H. P. Śāstri.

4 Vide *Citracampū* by Bāṇeśvara Vidyālaṅkāra, Ed. R. Chakravarti, Benares, 1940, p. 89 (vv. 264-65) & Intro. p. 8.

5 The late Dr. Śāstri read 'janai(r)' instead of 'jane(r)' in l. 2 of the verse (*Vaṅgiya-Sāhitya-Pariṣat-Patrickā*, vol. XXXVII, p. 138). We have given preference to the reading of S. Sāmaśrami as more suitable in style and sense.

Cirañjīva was established as a distinguished professor at Benares teaching various subjects:—

सोऽहं पुरा समधिगम्य पितुः प्रसादं
ब्रह्मैकतां गतवतः शिवराजधान्यां ।
यत्नादधीतमनधीतमथापि शास्त्रम्
अध्यापयामि निभृतं निपुणं विचार्य ॥ (I. 21)

The pan-Indian popularity of most of his works was due apparently to their publication from Benares, the meeting ground of scholars from all parts of India.

The *Vṛttaratnāvalī* was written for the benefit of the author's patron-chief Yaśavanta Siṃha. As the printed edition of this interesting book is not easily available we cite below the introductory verses (2-4) referring to that chief.

श्रीगोवर्द्धनभूपनन्दन तव प्रोढामवीरस्फुरत्-
संग्रामे यशवन्तसिंह महिमारम्भातिसम्भावनाम् ।
सद्यश्चिह्नकवन्धकन्धरगलद्वाराभरामोदिता
सा चगडी सह योगिनीभिरभितः संवर्द्धयत्याशिषा ॥२
विद्वद्भिः परिवारभारकलनप्रोद्धूतचिन्तालगै-
भूपालैः कमलाविलासरसिकैः संत्यज्यमानादरा ।
गौडश्रीयशवन्तसिंह-नृपते त्वां बद्धशुद्धादरा
कालेऽस्मिन्नाधिदेवता खलु गिरां संवर्द्धयत्याशिषा ॥३
वैरिघातविमर्द्दनिष्कृप ! कृपारामैकवंशध्वज !
छन्दःशास्त्रविचारपारग ! यशःकर्पूरपूरोज्ज्वल ।
गौडश्रीयशवन्तसिंह-नृपते मद्रुत्तरत्नावली-
वृत्ताकर्णनतः स्वकर्णपुटयोर्मधुर्यमाधारय ॥४

(*Vṛttaratnāvalī*, Serampore Ed., p. 3)

Yaśavanta (not Yaśovanta) was thus a son of Govardhana and a descendant of Kṛpārāma. He has been very frequently addressed in the body of the book with epithets like 'Gauḍa-kṣetra-kṣaunī-nātha' (p. 5), 'Gauḍa-vaṃśa-tilaka' (p. 7), 'Gauḍāvaninātha' (p. 8), 'Gauḍakṣmābhṛd-vaṃśottama' (p. 12) and 'Gauḍa-vaṃśa-haṃsa' (p. 15). In the *Kāvyavilāsa* also there are seven verses in praise of this chief (pp. 7, 11, 20, 27, 30 & 50) with the epithet 'Gauḍa' in

two of them (pp. 7 & 50). Moreover, among the illustrations of the *Kāvyaṭilāsa* we find a number of panegyrics upon various contemporary chiefs viz. Jayasiṃha (p. 45), Hṛdaya (pp. 16, 19 & 35) and Kīrti (p. 50), besides former kings Kṛpārāma (p. 18), Vijayasiṃha (p. 39) and Mānasiṃha (p. 49). It seems that Cirañjīva was connected with the great College at Benares founded by Mirza Raja Jayasiṃha (d. 1666 A.D.),⁶ where he came in contact with many local chiefs. We are, however, confronted here with the current theory about the date of Cirañjīva.

The late Dr. H. P. Śāstrī regarded Yaśavanta as a native of Bengal putting an easy interpretation to the term 'Gauḍa' applied to him and identified him with Yaśovanta Siṃha, Naib Dewan of Dacca under Nawab Suja-ud-Din (1727-39 A.D.).⁷ Dr. Śāstrī stuck to this view in face of a number of conflicting evidences, which may be briefly summarised as follows:—

(i) Cirañjīva's father Rāghavendra was a student at Navadvīpa not later than about 1600 A.D. Cirañjīva, therefore, can hardly be brought down farther than 1700 A.D.

(ii) In an illustration of the *Kāvyaṭilāsa* (p. 12) the name of Raghudeva Bhaṭṭācārya is mentioned in a way showing that he was Cirañjīva's revered teacher and was probably still alive. This scholar is clearly identical with the famous Naiyāyika Raghudeva Nyāyālaṅkāra who flourished at Benares about 1650 A.D. He lent his name to a document written at Benares in 1657 A.D.⁸ In the

6 Tavernier in his *Travels* (Constable, vol. II, pp. 234-5) gives an interesting account of this institution, which he visited in December, 1665.

7 *Notices of Sans. Mss.*, vol. III, No. 280. In the *Sāhitya-Pariṣat-Patrikā*, vol. XXXVII, p. 135 Dr. Śāstrī stated that Yaśovanta was originally a Zemindar of Rāḍha. The only chief of this name who can be traced in the region was Yaśom(v)anta Siṃha of Karpāgarh in the Midnapore district who was Zemindar in 1711-48 A.D. (A. C. Gupta: *Hugli*, pp. 186-7). But his father's name was Rāmasiṃha and there was no Kṛpārāma in the family.

8 R. S. Pimputkar: *Tittebbhaṭṭa-prakaraṇa*, p. 79.

Saraswati Bhavana Library of the Benares Sanskrit College there are two small tracts of Raghudeva copied respectively in the years 1709 (1652 A.D.) and 1716 V.S. (1659 A.D.).⁹ Cirañjīva apparently read with him in the 2nd quarter of the 17th century A.D.

(iii) A Ms. copy of the *Kāvyaṭīkā* is dated 1732 V.S. (1675 A.D.). Dr. Śāstrī admits that this date is "too early for Cirañjīva."¹⁰ The *Kāvyaṭīkā*, as we have stated above, was the last of his literary works as far as available. The lower limit of the period of his literary activity is thus fixed on the strength of this Ms. of 1675 A.D. It is, therefore, impossible to place him in the middle of the 18th century.

(iv) Cirañjīva belonged to the village Guptapalli or Guptipārā in the Hughly district and according to old traditions current in the village he preceded his co-villager Mathureśa Vidyālaṅkāra who wrote the *Śyūrirākālpalātā* in 1672 A.D.¹¹

The above evidence points to the conclusion that the identification of Yaśavanta proposed by Dr. Śāstrī is no longer tenable. Jayasiṃha, who is amply praised in a verse of the *Kāvyaṭīkā* as evidently a living monarch, should better be taken as the great Mīrza Rājā Jayasiṃha and not his descendant Jayasiṃha II as surmised by Dr. Śāstrī. It is an interesting problem for research to identify the other princes commemorated in that book viz. Vijaya-siṃha, Kīrti (siṃha) and Hṛdaya (siṃha). We shall attempt to trace the history of the family to which Yaśavanta belonged on the evi-

9 *Cat. of Sans. Mss.* vol. II (Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika), 1937, No. 1100 (Muktivāda) & No. 1106 (Sāmagrīvāda).

10 L. 4125. *Descr. Cat. of Sans. Mss.*, A.S.B., vol. VI, pp 461-2.

11 *Bhāratavarṣa* (Bengali Monthly), vol. II, pt. ii, p. 944 Harimohan Pramanik (1820-73) wrote a book in Bengali on the 'Chronology of Indian Poets' (*Bhāratavarṣa-kavidiṅgera samayanirūpaṇa*) which was published by his son in 1302 B.E. (1895). Cirañjīva's account is found in pp. 126-28 and it is stated that his descendant in the 5th generation Hema Candra Bhaṭṭācāryya was living when the book was written.

dence of a little known work still existing in Mss.—the *Rāmaprakāśa* ascribed to Rājā Kṛpārāma, the patron of Cirañjīva's father.

The Rāmaprakāśa

In the library of the India Office, London, there are two Ms. copies of this book. We recently came across another copy in the Edward VII Anglo-Sanskrit Library, Navadvīpa. It is written in the Nāgara script and is complete in 449 fols., each page containing 14 lines. The introductory verses containing important personal details about the royal author are reproduced below :

प्रणम्य सकलेशानं सकलेशानलुप्ये ।
 कालतत्त्वार्णवे रामप्रकाशं सेतुमादधे ॥
 महेशानकृपाराम-कृपारामेण तेन तु ।
 सम्पादनीयो ग्रन्थोऽयमानन्दयतु सन्मनः ॥
 यदुद्धिः सदसद्विवेकनिपुणा द्रागेव जाग्रद्यशो-
जाहंगीर-महीमहेन्द्रगणिता श्रेष्ठेन सदृद्धिषु ।
 यन्नीतीरवगत्य सन्नयगुरुः शुक्रोपि मोहात् क्षणं
 स्तब्धश्चालितशीर्षमीषदसकृन्नीतिं पुनः प्रेक्षते ॥
 कर्तव्यानिह कुर्वतोऽपि विषयान्नासक्लिमत्वेच्छतो
 यस्यानन्दिहृदः सदैव परमब्रह्मैकनिष्ठ मनः ।
 दातुः परिहृतमण्डले विहरतो विद्याविचारेच्छया
 दीने यस्य दया श्रुतिस्मृतिगताचारः समुन्मीलति ॥
 शौर्यं यस्य महाप्रतापनृपतेर्जागर्ति मूर्ध्नि स्थितं
 कीर्तिर्यस्य जनानुरञ्जनकरी विश्वग्दिशो धावति ।
 यत्सूनुः समरे द्विषत्क्षितिभुजः शूरान् निहन्ति क्षणा-
 द्दाता वीरविमर्दनः पृथुमतिर्नाम्ना च गोवर्द्धनः ॥
 श्रीमद्भूपसमूहवन्दितपद-श्रीसाहज**ाहंगीर-कृपा-**
 पात्रं यादवराय-वर्मतनयो माणिक्यचन्द्रान्वयः ।
 गौडक्षत्रकुलोद्भवो भुवि कृपारामाभिधो भूमिपो
 ग्रन्थं धर्मकृतां कृते रचयितुं तस्मिन् मनो यो दधौ ॥
 न्यायादिशास्त्रेषु कृतश्रमस्य स्मृत्यर्थहृष्टेरितगौडभूतेः ।
 ग्रन्थेऽल्ल नानामतनिर्यायाग्रथा शतावधानस्य कृतिर्मुदे स्यात् ॥
 सन्ति यद्यपि भूयांसो ग्रन्था एकोत्तमोत्तमाः ।
 तथापि कश्चनास्वादमयमुत्पादयिष्यति ॥

शास्त्रतत्त्वार्थसंज्ञानाद् ये धीरा गतमत्सराः ।

गुणग्राहितया तेषामत्र दृष्टिर्भविष्यति ॥

हेमाद्रि-माधवादीनां गौडानां तत्त्वदर्शिनां ।

सम्मतं समभिज्ञाय ग्रन्थोऽयं परिनिर्मितः ॥

तेषां मिथो यच्च विरुद्धमागतं मतं विचारेण च तत्र यच्छिष्यं ।

तदचितं चाल मनो विचक्षणैः क्षणं निवेश्यं सदसत्प्रबुद्धये ॥

अथ शुचितत्कालजीवी कर्म कुर्यादित्यादिविधां.....

The contents and extent of this copy agrees with the first copy in Bengali script preserved in the India Office library.¹² But the present copy contains a much better and lengthy colophon, recording important facts, which is, therefore, fully reproduced below :

प्रबलयुवदशायां वृद्धशीलो गभीरो

बुधसदसि सुधीरः सूक्ष्मशास्त्रार्थदृष्टिः ।

विनयनयसमुद्रो दानधर्मे प्रबुद्धो

विषमसमरसिंहो रूपवान् यस्य सूनुः ॥

दिशि विदिशि निहत्य द्वेषिभूपान् महोपमान्

तदमितवनितानामूर्द्धनादाश्रुपूर्वैः ।

जनयति खलु वर्षाकालभावं सदैव

बहुवितरणशीलो गौड-गोवर्द्धनाख्यः ॥

वृषे यस्मिन् पाणौ कृतवति कृपाणीं सचकितं

प्रतीपक्षौणीपा गिरिदरदरीगर्भमहह ।

निषेवन्ते गूढास्तुरगवरमारोहति सति

प्रयात्युर्वीं गुर्वीं खुरपुटहतातङ्कमभितः ॥

कृपारामो दामोदरचरणसेवैकक्षरणः

शिवध्यायी विध्याचरणचतुरो दाननिपुणः ।

धराधन्यो गौडान्वयजनितकीर्तिर्नरवरः

स धर्मार्थं ग्रन्थं स्मृतिषु विदितार्थं व्यरचयत् ॥ कुलकं

भट्टाचार्य-शतावधान-कृतिणि न्यायादिशास्त्रार्थविदु-

वर्ये द्वैतमते तदेकतरतो निर्णायके भूरिशः ।

आज्ञां तत्र विधाय धर्मविदुषां हर्षाय सम्पादिते

ग्रन्थेऽस्मिन् विमले प्रयान्तु सुषियां चेतांसि निर्विगणतां ॥

समारब्धो विघ्नप्रकरहर-गोवर्द्धनरुचेः
समाप्तोऽयं ग्रन्थः क्षितिपतिकृपारामरचितः ।
व्यवस्थासामग्रया मुनिवचनगूढार्थनिचय-
प्रकाशो विज्ञार्थं हरचरणयोरर्पित इति ॥

इति गोडक्षवकुलावतंस-यादवरायात्मज-माणिक्यचन्द्रान्वय-महामतिक-परमज्ञानि-विराज-
मानमानोन्नतकीर्त्तिप्रतापोजित-नृपति-श्रीकृपारामा (नुनोत-श्रीशतावधान-भट्टाचार्य-) विरचितः
कालतत्त्वार्णवसन्तरणोपाय-सेतुभूतस्तिथ्यादिकालनिर्णायको रामप्रकाशनामा ग्रन्थः समाप्तः
इति संवत् १७०४ वर्षे कार्तिकमासे शुक्लपक्षे अष्टम्यां तिथौ रविवारान्वितायां वृश्चिकलग्ने
शुभस्थाने इंदुरखी-नामनगरे ॥

श्रीकृपारामनामगौडराज्ये तस्यात्मज-श्रीगोवर्द्धनगौडराज्ये तस्यात्मज-श्रीपहारसिंह गौड-
राज्ये शुभं ॥

माध्यन्दिनीयशाखायां यजुर्वेदाध्यायि-श्रीमहायाज्ञिकवाघाग्रिहोत्रिणां स्वीयात्मजश्रीदुर्वा-
सोऽग्रिहोत्रिणाः पाठार्थं शुभं पुस्तकमिदं लिखितं । अन्तर्वेदिस्थ विगहुली-ग्रामीयशुक्लभि-
धायिना । यादृशं पुस्तकं दृष्टं तादृशं लिखितं मया । यदि शुद्धमशुद्धं वा मम दोषो न
विद्यते ॥ शुभं ॥

The paper and writing of this copy are not more than 150 years old, so the date recorded, corresponding to October, 1647 A.D., is undoubtedly that of the composition of the book itself falling in the reign of emperor Shah Jahan. In the body of the book at the end of the different sections the colophon is fully given (e.g. fol. 58a, 94b etc.) and everywhere the phrase 'अनुनीतश्रीशतावधानभट्टाचार्य' has been added in the margin. A superscript (in Bengali character) at the end of the copy gives the name of the owner:—श्रीआनन्दचन्द्र भट्टाचार्यस्य पुस्तकमिदं शां गुप्तपाडा मिरडान्ना । The copy eventually passed into the Palace Library of the *Nadia Raj* at Kṛṣṇanagara, whence it came to Navadvipa. The book was composed at the town of *Indurakhī* apparently in the dominion of the 'Gauḍa' chief Kṛpārāma and his distinguished son Govardhana, who again was already blessed with a son named Pahārasimha. This latter name we take to be only a local and popular surname in his boyhood of the prince who came later to be known as Yaśavanta-simha. The identification of the kingdom of Kṛpārāma and one of its towns *Indurakhī* becomes clear by a passage of the book. In a

section on *Agastyodaya* (Heliacal rising of the star Canopus) we read :—

एवञ्च अर्गलायां महाराजचक्रवर्तिनगरे षडङ्गुलपरिमिता, तत्र मथ्याङ्गे शङ्खच्छाया ६ भवति ।.....सिंहस्थसूर्यस्य २० तमांशानन्तरे निशान्ते अर्गलापुरे अगस्त्योदयः । लाहा-यिर-मध्येपि भूपतिकृपाराम-राजधान्यां प्रायस्तथैवेति ॥ (fol. 431b-432a)

Argalā is evidently the Sanskritised form of Agra, which was then the capital of the Mughal empire and the capital of the kingdom of Kṛpārāma Lāhāir was not far removed from it. Both Lāhār and Indurakhī are now situated in the Gwalior State and both the places were visited by Mr. J. D. Beglar of the Archaeological Survey in 1871-2 A.D.¹³ There are ruins of forts said to belong to the Marhatta period. The term 'Gauḍa' apparently signifies that the family of Kṛpārāma originally belonged to the 'Gond' tribe, which founded several states during this period in the Central Provinces. What led a distinguished Bengali scholar like Śatāvadhāna Bhaṭṭācārya to seek patronage of this Gond chief cannot be ascertained. But it is apparent that emperor Shah Jahan's well-known patronage upon Hindu scholars drew them towards the metropolis from farthest parts of India. Rāghavendra must have gone there with a number of Bengali adventurers and his connection with the court of Kṛpārāma was kept up at least for two generations. The *Rāmaprakāśa* was composed at the town of Indurakhī, where evidently Rāghavendra resided and it is interesting to note a piece of evidence which seems to point to a colony of Bengali settlers in this city. Describing the ruins at Indurakhī Mr. Beglar wrote :—

"At Indurakhī there are some *chhatris* with curved eaves and ridges to the roofs, like the thatched houses and curve-ridged temples of Lower Bengal." (p. 38).

The second copy of the *Rāmaprakāśa* in the India Office library in *Nāgara* script has been described as a book separate from the first one. This, however, appears to be very doubtful; for, though this

13 *Arch. Surv. Ind.*, vol. VII (Bundelkhand & Malwa), p. 38.

copy begins with an unknown commentary on the *Kālanirṇaya-dīpikā*, perhaps by mistake, almost the whole of the book agrees in contents with the copy at Navadvīpa. Thus, ¹⁴ संवत्सरान्तकालस्वरूपनिर्णयः ends on fol. 90b (India Office) = fol. 66a (Navadvīpa) • सामान्यतिथ्यन्त निर्णयः ends on fol. 133b (India Office) = fol. 94b (Navadvīpa). व्रतादिविषये तिथ्यादिकालनिर्णयः ends on fol. 511b (India Office) = fol. 359b (Navadvīpa). This India Office copy ends (fol. 588) with इष्टिकालनिर्णय corresponding to fol. 395b of the Navadvīpa copy and is thus wanting in the last three sections of the book viz. Grahaṇanirṇaya (to fol. 410b), Saṅkrānti (fol. 425a) and Māsakṛtya (fol. 449a).

The *Rāmāprakāśa*, however, had other parts on different topics, which have not yet been discovered. For, on fol. 430b it is stated जलशुद्धौ विशेषान्तरं च श्राद्धादिकाण्डे रामप्रकाशे अवधातव्यम्। So also on fol. 359b:—

अथ श्राद्धस्वरूपं श्राद्धप्रभेदः श्राद्धस्य नित्यनैमित्तिककाम्यमेदादिकं च श्राद्धखण्डे राम-प्रकाशे वक्ष्यते, इदानीं मयामावस्याश्राद्धविषये किञ्चिदुक्ता तत्र श्राद्धकालनिर्णयः प्रस्तूयते।

Kṛpārāma and possibly his son Govardhana also along with Rāghavendra evidently died soon after 1647 A.D. and the next two decades form the period of activity of Govardhana's son Yaśavanta and his protégé Cirañjīva. But the subsequent history of the family is unknown and we invite the attention of local historians to this interesting subject. It is our conjecture that some sort of communication with that far off kingdom continued in the family of Cirañjīva and one of his descendants, possibly, was thus able to obtain possession of a valuable Ms. belonging originally to an *Agnihotrī* of that region.

DINESH CHANDRA BHATTACHARYYA

The Cālukyas of Kalyāṇi*

Taila II (973-997 A.D.)

The Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire could not recover from the shock it received from the Paramāra invasion. The dynasty would have, probably, collapsed at this time but for the timely intervention and help of the Gaṅga prince Mārasimha. In this decline of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa power, coupled with the incapable rulers, the ground was prepared for Taila II to complete the work of usurpation begun by his father two years before. The Paramāra invasion had proved a great strain on the then poor resources of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. This resulted into almost a revolution and a chaos; and the bond of allegiance, uniting the outlying districts and provinces and the feudatory princes with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarchy, loosened according to the practice of the Indian mediaeval state system, which had become a tradition. The attempt, with timely success, to save the crown by the Gaṅga prince Mārasimha, was nothing but a lull before a sweeping storm. A scion of the house of the Cālukyas—Vikramāditya IV—had already declared himself independent in the Kadambaḷige 1000 division of the empire. The whole structure of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire was tottering from its very foundations. A final blow for the crash was required; and it came only two years after the defeat of Khoṭṭiga at the hands of the Paramāra Siyaka II. Taila II, it seems, carefully prepared himself for the task in his father's principality of the Kadambaḷige division and in the year 973 A.D., he attacked the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kakkala II, defeated and overthrew him and captured his capital Māṇyakheta., and made it the capital of his own dominions. He was ruling from there in 993 A.D. (*ASR.*, 1930-34,

* Continued from *IHQ.*, vol. XIII, p. 254.

I, 241). The success achieved by Taila II was complete. The events passed with a dramatic rapidity and once again the Cālukya sovereignty, usurped by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga and Kṛṣṇa I,¹ was restored after a gap of more than two hundred years.

From the Gundūr stone inscription² dated June 973 A.D. it is gathered that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kakkala II was ruling in Mānyakheta in that year. After which date there is no evidence to show that he any more held sway over Mānyakheta. Taila II became king in Saṃvatasara Śrīmukha (973 A.D.). The Bhadrā copper plate³ of the Śilāhāra Aparājita, a feudatory of the Cālukya Taila II, dated in 997 A.D. (June) after giving the genealogy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas describes the overthrow of Kakkala II "as a light extinguished by a fierce wind and that of the Raṭṭa rule there remained only the memory." The Kharepatan plates⁴ dated Śaka 930 (= 1008 A.D.) state that Kakkala II was a popular king and had won many victories by his prowess; and further it states: "Having defeated this king (i.e. Kakkala II) in battle the lion-like and glorious king Tailapa, of the Cālukya race descended from Yayāti, came to the throne." Though the information about the result is complete, but the details about the steps leading to it and the nature of the struggle are wanting. The Niḷguṇḍa plates only state that Taila II was easily⁵ successful in the struggle. He saved his life by flying away from the field as suggested by Dr. Altekar.⁶ The Kaḷige plates give the following account of the incident "having first uprooted (and) slain some of the Raṭṭas.....king Taila,—the mighty one, (who inspired) fear by the pride of (his) arm assumed the asylum of sovereignty of the Cālukyas and became free from all troubles (ruling), alone over the whole circuit of the earth for 24 years, beginning with the year Śrīmukha."⁷

1 *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. II, pp. 389 ff.

2 *IA.*, vol. XII, pp. 271.

3 *El.*, vol. III, p. 270.

4 *JBRRAS.*, vol. I, p. 221.

5 सुखेन ।

6 Altekar—*Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their times*, p. 131.

7 *IA.*, vol. XII, p. 270.

Though the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were driven away from Māṇyakhṇa, they still held some territory near about the modern Dharwar district of Bombay Presidency under the protection of their relative, the Gaṅga prince Mārasinḥa. From the Hebbāl stone inscription⁸ it is gathered that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Indra IV was ruling in 974 A.D. Yet another inscription states that the Gaṅga prince performed the anointment ceremony of Indra IV.⁹ Mārasinḥa was himself ruling over Vanavāsi 12,000, Nalambavādi 32,000, Gangavādi 96,000, Sāntaliḡe 1000, Belvoḡa 300, Purigere 300, Kiṣukāḡ 70 and Bagenāḡ 70.¹⁰ He once again attacked the Vanavāsi and "captured all the possessions.....of the ruler of the Vanavāsi country,"¹¹ which certainly must have become a part of the Cālukya territory. Mārasinḥa certainly made a bold bid to restore the fortune of their relatives,¹² but he met with little or no success. His death in June/July 974 A.D.¹³ sealed the fate of Indra IV once for all. He also died on March 20, 982 A.D. by 'performing the Jain vow of Sāllekhaṇa or self-starvation.'¹⁴

Thus, Taila II, variously called Tailappa, Tailappayya, Tailapa, Nurmūṇḡi—Taila securely established himself on the Rāṣṭrakūṭa throne by the end of the year 973 A.D. He made Māṇyakhṇa his capital as already stated. Taila II adopted Āhavamalla, "the wrestler in war," as his biruda. His titles as they appear in the inscriptions are Mahārājāḡdhirāja-Parameśvara-Paramabhaṡṡāraka, Samastabhuvanāśraya, Śrīmad Āhavamalladeva,¹⁵ which mean "the refuge of the universe, the favourite of the fortune and of the earth, the frontal ornament of the family of Satyāśraya, the ornament of the

8 *IA.*, XII, pp. 270-71; *EL.*, vol. IV, pp. 350 ff. 9 *EC.*, vol. II, No. 59.

10 *EL.*, vol. IV, p. 355.

11 *EC.*, vol. II, No. 59

12 Mārasinḥa was the son of the daughter of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Vaddiga Amoghavarṣa; and Indra IV was the son of the sister of Mārasinḥa i.e. daughter's daughter of Vaddiga. *EC.*, vol. II, No. 59.

13 *EL.*, vol. IV, p. 351; V, pp. 152, 168 ff.

14 *IA.*, vol. XX, p. 35.

15 *EL.*, vol. IV, p. 206.

Cālukyas.” Such titles were in vogue in those days and they were regularly used by Taila II and his successors. Taila II had also the title of Bhujabala-vira-Nārāyaṇa.¹⁶

Taila II married Jākabba, daughter of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa chieftain Bhammaha.¹⁷ Nothing is known either about this Rāṣṭrakūṭa chieftain or anything about his relationship with the Imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭas. It seems probable that he may have been a feudatory of the Imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭas, but after their overthrow, he, for his future safety and position, concluded peace with Taila II by giving his daughter in marriage to him. There is no mention of a second queen and Jākabba seems to have been the chief queen of Taila II.

War with the Coḷas

The sudden change in the political map of the Deccan and Taila's successful occupation of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa capital and empire aroused the jealousy of other neighbouring ruling dynasties, and they at once challenged Taila, who was also not slow to accept it. The Coḷas at this time were extending their frontiers and asserting their power. Taila II certainly compelled them to accept the *fait accompli*. It is very difficult to say if any battle between the two powers actually took place, but the Cālukya records claim victory over the Coḷas.¹⁸ The Sogaḷ inscription¹⁹ describes Taila as “an axe to that great mountain, the portent Coḷa.” Another inscription²⁰ records that the frightened Coḷa king was bewildered because of the fear and the power of Taila II and could not decide ‘what to do and where to go.’ The defeat of the Coḷas, if at all any war took place, was accomplished before 980 A.D., which is the date recorded in the Sogaḷ inscription. The Coḷa empire at that time was governed by Parakeśari Uttama-Coḷa, who ruled from 969 to 985 A.D.²¹ The

16 *I.M.P.*, vol. I, Cd. No. 580, p. 627.

18 *IA.*, vol. V, p. 17.

20 *Ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 207.

17 *EL.*, vol. XII, pp. 144, 152.

19 *EL.*, vol. XVI, pp. 1 ff.

21 K. A. Nilkanta Sastri, *Coḷas*, I, p. 18L.

Pāṇḍyas are also mentioned among those who submitted to the power of Taila II. It seems that Taila had not to fight against them. The victory over the Coḷas, if at all any engagement took place, was sufficient to frighten them, because in the Sogaḷ inscription they are also referred to have been frightened and could not decide 'where to go and what to do.' The Pāṇḍya king at this time was Amarabhujāṅga, who was defeated and deprived of his territories by the Coḷa Rājarāja, the Great. The king of Utkal mentioned in the inscription refers to the Paramāra Muñja, who was known as Utpalarāja. He also followed the example of the Coḷas and the Pāṇḍyas.

War with the Gaṅga Pañcāladeva

The story of the attempt of the Gaṅga prince Mārasimha for the restoration of the Rāṣtrakūṭa empire and his failure; the attempt to anoint Kṛṣṇa IV as king and establish a sort of *imperium in imperio*; and the death of Mārasimha in 974 A.D. have been narrated. After the death of Mārasimha, one Pañcāladeva established himself on the throne of the former. Pañcāladeva, during the reign of Mārasimha, was governing a few villages forming the Sebbi 30,²² perhaps, as a deputy of Mārasimha, who himself was governing the Gangavāḍi 96000, Purigere 300 and the Belvoḷa 300 in 971-72 A.D.²³ He was then placed as a governor of Gangavāḍi 96000 in 973-74 A.D. After the death of Mārasimha, because of the chaos and confusion due to the fall of an imperial power which had served as a connecting link, Pañcāla usurped the territory ruled by Mārasimha. The Mulaguṇḍa inscription states that he was ruling as a 'paramount sovereign in 974-75 A.D. over the whole country bounded by the eastern, western and the southern ocean',²⁴ which means only that he was ruling over the territories held by Mārasimha, which included the Banavāsī 12000 (?), Noḷambavāḍi 32000, the Sāntalige

22 *El.*, vol. IV, p. 255.

23 *Ibid.*

24 *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. ii, p. 307.

1000 and also the Gangavādi 96000. Pañcāla was certainly an usurper and an adventurer and not a legitimate successor, because, from the inscription²⁵ it can be said definitely that Mārasimha was succeeded by his son Rācamalla, who had the famous minister Cāmuṇḍarāja and his earliest known date is 977 A.D.²⁶ Pañcāladeva, then, ruled the Gaṅga empire between 974 and 977 A.D. and it is not known in what way he was connected with the Gaṅga house.

The establishment of a rival usurper on the borders of the empire threatened the position of Taila II, who, at once, in Pañcāladeva, recognised the danger. He would in no case suffer his adversary to establish a rival power on the confines of his dominions and proceeded to purge out this impending danger. Pañcāladeva has been referred to as the 'Cālukya-pañcānana' 'lion to the Cālukyas' in his Mula-guṇḍa inscription,²⁷ but the Cālukya inscription says that Pañcāladeva was defeated and killed in battle by Taila II. The Gaḍag inscription²⁸ of Vikramāditya VI mentions that "Taila took the head of Pañcāla by the terror of the pride of his arm in battle." Pañcāla of the Gaḍag inscription is no other than the Gaṅga Pañcāladeva. He was defeated in battle and his head, severed from the body, was taken off to Kalyāṇi; probably to be exposed to scorn for the sin he had done by calling himself a 'Cālukya-pañcānana.' Besides the epigraphic evidence, there is the literary corroboration. The Canarese poet Raṇṇa in his work *Ajittīrthakaraapurāṇa*, mentions that Āhavamalla i.e. Taila II inflicted a severe defeat on the army of Pañcāladeva in which his general Nāgadeva took a prominent part.²⁹ Mr. Rice in *Karnāṭakaśabdānuśāsanam* makes a very wrong identification of Āhavamalla with Iṣivabedāṅga Satyāśraya. Āhavamalla, on chronological grounds, can only be identified with Taila II.

²⁵ *EC.*, vol. II, Intro. p. 44.

²⁶ Rice—*Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions*, p. 47.

²⁷ *El.*, vol. VI, p. 259, v. 4.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. VI, pp. 71-72.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, vol. XV, p. 356.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

Satyāśraya ruled after 997 A.D., while Rācamalla ascended the throne after the death of Pañcāladeva in 977 A.D. On the face of these facts no doubt as regards the identification of Āhavamalla with Taila II should be entertained.

About the date of the battle this much can only be said that it took place between 974 A.D.,—the last date of Mārasimha—and 977 A.D.—the earliest known date of Rācamalla.

War with the Paramāra Vākapati Muñja

The Paramāra Muñja, also known from his title as Vākapati, signifying his poetic genius, ascended the throne of Mālava in the year V.S. 1031 = A.D. 974 or a little earlier.³¹ His predecessor Siyaka II, Harṣa had defeated the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Khoṭṭiga Nityāvarṣa and the Udayapura Praśasti speaks of his victory over the latter;³² but the victory, as is evident, could not be made final and the defeat, crushing though it was, was nullified by Mārasimha,³³ who successfully defended Mānyakheta. In this attempt Siyaka II, probably, had an idea of conquest and this ambition seems to have lingered on in the heart of his successor, but that field of ambition was appropriated by another adventurer (?)—Taila II. Muñja was not to be daunted by this temporary set back and he started to cast the die. His one attempt before the year 982 A.D. seems to have been frustrated. The Nilguṇḍa inscription makes the statement that the king Utpala was “bewildered and deliberated as to ‘what to do, where to go to, and where to dwell’.”³⁴ The king Utpala mentioned in the inscription is no other than Vākapati II, the Paramāra king who bore another name Utpala.³⁵ This first attempt did not close the chapter of rivalry between the two houses. Merutuṅga³⁶ states that Muñja had defeated Taila II six times before his own capture by the latter.

31 *IA.*, vol. VI, p. 51.

33 *Ibid.*, p. 179.

35 *IA.*, vol. XXXVI, p. 168.

32 *El.*, vol. I, p. 237.

34 *El.*, vol. IV, p. 207.

36 Tawney—*Prabandha-cintāmaṇi*, p. 33.

The statement of Merutuṅga is corroborated by the Udayapura Praśasti³⁷ in which Vākapaṭi II is said to have defeated the Kaṇṇaṭas. The Niḷguṇḍa inscription and the Udaipur Praśasti claim at least one victory by their respective masters against the other. This goes to show that there was continued warfare between the two ruling dynasties. The singular alternate victory and defeat brought the matter to no final conclusion and the trouble continued. Merutuṅga³⁸ further tells us that "King of the Tiliṅga country, named Tailapa Deva, harrassed Muñja by sending raiders into his country." The sin of usurpation was doubled by the damnation of the sin of raids. To punish the king of the Tiliṅga country for this insolence, Muñja, it seems, again in a fit of anger 'determined to march against him,' though his prime-minister Rudrāditya seized by illness at this time tried to dissuade him with his sane counsel. He pointed out to the king that the Godāvārī river formed the utmost limit of his expedition and the limit should in no circumstance be crossed. But Muñja, intoxicated with the pride of his past victories and excited by the repeated incursions of the Kaṇṇaṭa raiders, disregarded with contempt the counsel of his prime minister. Merutuṅga then relates: 'in overwhelming confidence Muñja crossed the river (i.e. Godāvārī) and pitched his camp on the other side. When Rudrāditya heard what the king had done, he augured that some misfortune must result from the head-strong conduct of the king, and he himself entered the flames of a funeral pile. Then Tailapa by force and fraud cut the army of Muñja to pieces and took him a prisoner, binding him with a rope of reeds. He was put in prison and confined in a cage of wood and was waited upon by Taila's sister Mr̥ṇālavatī, with whom he formed a marriage union.' So the head-strong conduct of the king and the contemptuous disregard of the most intelligent counsels of the faithful minister ultimately boded ill and Muñja,

consequently, had to meet the worst fate. Further Merutuṅga says that his ministers, who came after him, hatched a plot to rescue their king. For this they dug a tunnel leading upto the prison and appointed the right hour for his escape, but the eyes of Mṛṇālavatī, sister of Tailapa, had pierced too deep in his heart. There in the solitude of the hellish prison-life, quite opposite to kingly-life of comforts and luxury, Muṇja had only one attraction and it seems that his poetic mind found there a consolation by enjoying the sweet and loving words of Mṛṇālavatī, who at times might have caressed the royal prisoner with her soft touches of sympathy and whereby slowly drinking the sweet honey of her beauty Muṇja in his poesy might have forgotten that he was a prisoner—a worst prisoner. Before leaving the prison through the secret tunnel the thongs of separation tortured him severely, yet he would not reveal the cause of his perturbation for fear of the matter being disclosed. In those moments when Muṇja was shortly to leave his beloved, he almost became mad of love and he could not recognise when Mṛṇālavatī gave him food without salt or with too much of salt. The treacherous Mṛṇālavatī here found her opportunity and lovingly asked him the cause of his sorrow. Without suspecting any foul play, Muṇja revealed the secret and foolishly addressed her: “If you will come there (to Ujjain), I will crown you as my consort, and show you the fruits of my favour.”

The revelation of the secret served as the death-knell for Muṇja. She at once said “Wait a minute, while I fetch a casket of jewels and thought that as she was a middle-aged-widow, Muṇja will cast her off in his home. So she went and told everything to her brother Taila.” Here the fate of Muṇja took a more sad turn. In order to expose him to special scorn, with a view to avenge the probable—imaginary—faithlessness that she would have had to face, she got him chained with cords and made him to beg about from door to door. It was then that Muṇja’s eyes were wide open and when taken from

'door to 'door, he would, in utter hopelessness, utter a warning against the treachery of a woman; but it was too late. Merutuṅga then relates a story of this time : when begging from one door to the other, a certain householder's wife gave Muñja butter-milk in the pot in his hand to drink and with pride refused to give him food when he begged for it. Here the pride of Muñja was awakened and he said to her:—

Foolish fair one, do not show pride, though you
see me with a little pot in my hand.

Muñja has lost fifteen hundred and seventy-six
elephants.

'After exhibiting the pride and person of Muñja to so much disgrace and misery, unbounded torture and shame, Taila put him to death. But this was not sufficient. Even his dead body was disgraced. 'His head was fixed on a stake in the court-yard of the palace, and by keeping it continually covered with thick sour-milk, he (Taila II) gratified his own anger.' Thus closed the sad chapter of the life of Muñja and his ambition brought him death with agony.

The *Bhojaprabandha* and *Navaśāhasāṅkacarita* are silent over this incident, but the epigraphic records of the Cālukyas and its corroboration by Merutuṅga prove its authenticity beyond any question. The Kauthem grant of Vikramāditya V, grand-son of Taila II, records that the latter put Utpalarāja in prison³⁹ and this Utpala-rāja is no other than Muñja.⁴⁰ The Yewür and Mīrāja inscriptions state the same thing. They record that Taila put that Utpala-rāja into prison who had defeated the Cedis, the Hūṇas, the Utkalas; who had caused the people of Marudeśa to tremble and so on.⁴¹ The

39 *IA.*, vol. XVI, p. 23.

40 *IA.*, vol. XXXVI, pp. 164-5.

41

हृणहरप्रतापदहनो यातालसन्मारवः
चैयच्छेदिखिलक्षमाजयनयव्युत्पन्नधीरोत्पलः ।
येनात्युग्ररणाभद्रशित प्रायुर्यशौर्योदयः

कारागारनिवेशितः कविदृषाः यम् वर्यायनघूर्यते ॥ *IA.*, vol. VIII, p. 15.

Gaḍag inscription of Vikramāditya VI clearly states that Taila defeated and slew Muñja.⁴² Yet another inscription speaks very boastingly of the same achievement.⁴³ It has been suggested by Dr. D. C. Ganguly⁴⁴ that in this contest Taila II was helped by the Mahā-sāmanta Bhillama II of the Yādava family,⁴⁵ who was ruling over the territory round about Khāndeśa. The Saṅgamner copper plate of Bhillama II states of his having crushed the army of Muñja and "thereby made the goddess of fortune observe the vow of a chaste woman in the house of the illustrious Raṇaraṅga-Bhīma."⁴⁶ The date of this record is Śaka 922 = 1000 A.D. and the title of Bhillama II also suggests that he was a feudatory chief. The Yādavas were feudatories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas⁴⁷ and it is very likely that after their overthrow they might have transferred their allegiance to the Cālukyas following other's example. Dr. Kielhorn identified Raṇaraṅga-Bhīma of the inscription, mentioned above, with Taila II on the ground that Raṇaraṅga-Bhīma is also a synonym of Āhavamalla, which was a biruda of Taila II. Dr. Barnett does not subscribe to this view, but if the evidence and circumstances are judged one feels inclined to accept Dr. Kielhorn's view, because the Paramāra kings had always an ambition to push their southern frontiers forward, which meant that the territories of the Yādavas lying on the borders of the Paramāra kingdom were to be incorporated. This ambition of the Paramāras might have compelled Bhillama II to throw his lot with Taila II, and he would have been glad to have an ally to be used

42 *El.*, vol. XV, p. 350.

43 *Ibid.*, vol. VI, p. 356.

44 Ganguly—*H.P.D.*, pp. 61-2.

45 *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. II, p. 430.

46 (स्वे)नारातिकरालकालर(च)ना चंडा(सि)दंडेनयो,
हत्वामुंजमहानृपप्रणयिनीम् संग्रामरंगागणे ।
लक्ष्मीम् अम्बु(म्बु)धिमेखलाबलयित(क्ष्मा)वर्तिनीम्
प्राणपदभूपश्रीरगभीमभवनसाक्षात्कुलस्त्रीव्रतम् ॥

El., vol. II, p. 218, ll. 40-42.

47 *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. II, pp. 512-13.

against Muṇja. Muṇja "was the main obstacle in the way of Tailapa's founding a Cālukya empire in the Deccan and his subsequent defeat and death alone made it possible for the latter to establish a paramount sovereignty."⁴⁸ Bhillama II might have participated in the war which was closely contested and sanguinary as Muṇja himself says that he lost more than fourteen hundred elephants, besides horses and foot men. About the date of the battle, it may be said that Amitagani finished his *Subhāṣitaratnasamdoha* in V.S. 1050 = 993-4 A.D.,⁴⁹ when Muṇja was ruling over Mālava. He does not refer to this battle, nor does he complete the life story of Muṇja till the latter's death. Taila closed his reign in the year 977 A.D., so this war took place between the years 994 and 977 A.D.

This was the most crowning victory of Taila II and there was no other power to threaten his position. The dynasty was firmly and securely established and the conquered territories were fully consolidated. There was none to challenge the title of conquest to the throne and the empire won at the point of the sword was to last for more than two hundred years. Though the struggle between the Paramāras and the Cālukyas continued, the former never gained any advantage over the latter.

Conquest of Lāṭa and the War with the Cālukyas

Almost the whole of the territory included in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire was slowly and steadily occupied by Taila II, but, as regards the Lāṭadeśa there is much difference of opinion and this point requires here some critical examination. In the *Rāsamālā*, it is mentioned that Gujrat 'was invaded by Bārp, the general of Tailappa, the sovereign of the Tiliṅgānā'⁵⁰ i.e. the Cālukya Taila II of Kalyāṇi.

⁴⁸ Ganguly, *H.P.D.*, p. 62; *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. pt. II, p. 432.

⁴⁹ *ZDMG.*, vols. 59 & 61 referred to by Dr. Ganguly in his *History of the Paramāras*, p. 62, fn. 3.

⁵⁰ Forbes, *Rāsa-Mālā*, vol. I, p. 52.

The account given in *Kirttikaumudī* calls Bārappa, 'a general of the lord of Lāṭa.'⁵¹ The Jain chronicler Arisimha calls him as 'general Bārapa, of the king of Kānyakubja.'⁵² The account given in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* agrees with that of *Rāsamālā*, where he is referred to as Bārava, the 'general of the monarch that ruled over the Tiliṅga country.'⁵³ But Hemacandra, the Jain priest calls him as king of Lāṭadeśa. So except Hemacandra, Bārappa has been called as a general of Taila II and in one case the general of the king of Lāṭa. Dr. Fleet is inclined to accept the account given in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* to be correct on the ground that the southern form of the name supports the statement.⁵⁴ From the inscriptions it is known that an independent branch of the Cālukyas was ruling over Lāṭa and was descended from Bārappa.⁵⁵ Trilocanapāla was the fifth king of the branch ruling in 1050 A.D. and Kirttirāja, grandson of Bārappa, according to the Nasik inscription, was ruling in 1018 A.D.⁵⁶ Bārappa was certainly a contemporary of the Caulukya Mūlarāja⁵⁷ (961-996 A.D.), who was attacked by the former though ultimately Cāmuṇḍarāja, son and later on successor of Mūlarāja, killed Bārappa.⁵⁸ Lāṭa was included in the dominions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and was probably conquered by Taila II after the overthrow of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa power. It⁵⁹ seems very difficult to say whether Bārappa was at all governing Lāṭa before Taila II. The copper plate grant of Trilocanapāla states that Bārappa was born in the family which had matrimonial connections with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and then it

51 लोटश्वरस्य सेनान्यमान्य पराक्रमः ।

दुर्वारं बारपं हत्वा हास्तिकं यः समग्रहीत् ॥

Kāthavāvatē, *Kirttikaumudī*, p. 9; *IA.*, vol. XII, p. 199.

52 *Sukrtasāṅkīrtan*, canto II, v. 5. *IA.*, vol. XII, p. 199.

53 Tawney, *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 63.

54 *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. I, p. 159.

55 *IA.*, vol. XII, pp. 196 ff.

56 *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. I, p. 158, fn. 2.

57 *Ibid.*, p. 158.

58 *Ibid.*, p. 159.

59 *IA.*, vol. XII, p. 201, v. 6, 8 and 9.

proceeds "who (Bārappa) having obtained the country of Lāṭa, verified to the delight of the people, the maxims of the science of politics : and who winning over his subjects and destroying his enemies, always obtained the fruit of the replenishment of his treasury."⁶⁰

This shows that Bārappa obtained the country from some one and then by his 'wise and politic rule' won the hearts of the people. This solves our difficulty. It is very probable that Taila II conquered Lāṭadeśa and as Bārappa belonged to his own family i.e. the Cālukya, he gave the country to him or in other words, he appointed Bārappa to govern Lāṭadeśa. Bārappa, then, by his high administrative capacity, won the hearts of the people and became semi-independent or Taila himself allowed Bārappa complete autonomy, verging almost to independence. The Sogaḷ inscription⁶¹ dated 980 A.D. speaks of Taila's victory over the Lāṭas and Taila is described as "a lion to those elephants the Lāṭas." Bārappa thus in fact got Lāṭa from Taila II after the latter's conquest of that country. He then invaded the Caulukyas of Aṇhilapaṭaṇa.

The author of the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* gives a detailed account of the encounter. He says that the dominions of the Caulukya Mūlarāja were simultaneously attacked by the king of Sapādalakṣa and Bārappa, the general of the Cālukya Taila II. Mūlarāja unable to face the two invaders, on the advice of his ministers, fled to Kanthādurga, Kanthākoṭa in Cutch. His expectations that the

60

कन्याकुब्जे महाराज राष्ट्रकूटस्य कन्यकां लब्ध्वा
शु(सु)खाय तस्यां त्वं चौलुक्याप्नुहि संततिम्

*

*

*

बारप्पराज इति विश्रुतनामधेयो राजावभूवभुविनाशितलोक शोकः ॥८॥

श्रीलाटदेशमधिगम्य कृतानियेन सत्यानि नीति

वचनानानि मुदेजनानाम्

तत्तानुरज्य जनमाशु निहत्यशङ्कन् कोशस्य

वृद्धिफलमाप नरंतरं यः ॥९॥

Id., vol. XII, p. 201, vs. 6, 8-9.

Sapādalakṣa king would go back to worship the goddess Śākambhari during the Navarātra, at that time he could crush Bārappa, proved wrong. Ultimately by his bold act of a personal interview with the Cauhāna king, Mūlarāja succeeded in persuading the former to keep peace till he has settled accounts with Bārappa. Mūlarāja, freed from the danger of an attack from behind, when he was busy in fighting the other, immediately attacked Bārappa and emerged out successful from the struggle. Mūlarāja got a rich booty comprising of 18 elephants and 10,000 horses. After his return he found that his other adversary had silently slipped away.⁶² The account given in *Dvyāśraya*⁶³ differs from that of the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*. In *Dvyāśraya* the story runs that once Bārappa, king of Lāṭadeśa, sent an ill-omened elephant to the court of Mūlarāja. The experts recognised the defects of the elephant and the whole action of Bārappa was interpreted as a direct insult done to the king, and which it was too much to be tolerated. Mūlarāja at once with his son Cāmuṇḍarāja and his army started to avenge the insult. The army advanced frightening the people, and the Lāṭa king i.e. Bārappa prepared for the battle. But he was slain in the action by Cāmuṇḍarāja. After this the son and the father returned to their capital. On the face of these conflicting accounts it is very difficult to extract the truth. The author of the *Hammirakāvya* gives a third version.⁶⁴ In that it is stated that Mūlarāja was defeated and slain by the Cauhāna king. The truth in this case as suggested by Dr. Fleet⁶⁵ is this that Mūlarāja suffered a defeat at the hands of the Ajmer king. Dr. Fleet thinks that in that case again the victory of Mūlarāja over Bārappa would seem improbable.

The whole fact may be summarised thus that Bārappa invaded Gujṛāt, very probably, simultaneously with the Cauhāna king, but was certainly defeated and killed by Mūlarāja in the battle.

62 Tawney—*Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 25

64 *Hammirakāvya*, p. 11, v. 9.

63 'Dvyāśraya', *IA.*, vol. IV, p. 111.

65 *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. I, p. 159.

Taila II reigned for 24 years beginning with the year Śrīmukha Saṃvatsara i.e. 973-74 A.D. as the Gaḍag inscription of Vikramāditya VI states.⁶⁶ The twenty-fourth year of his reign falls in 997 A.D. His last known date from the Bhadnā grant is Śaka 919, Hemālamba Saṃvatsara, Āsāḍha, ba. 4—25th or 26th June, 997 A.D.⁶⁷ and the earliest known date from his inscription is 975 A.D.⁶⁸

An estimate of Taila II

Taila II, judged from his achievements, seems to be a great fighter and personally a brave man. The inscriptions of his feudatories and successors speak very highly of his martial character and literary exploits. With the few resources that he might have had at his command,—his father being a master of a small division only—he with one blow toppled down the powerful Rāṣtrakūṭas from their throne. Before his arms their empire fell and crashed like a house of cards. It was not only the opportunity—though certainly it played a decisive part and helped him in getting the crown—but, certainly, it was his bravery that brought him the empire. It was only the strength of the arm and his generalship which saved his work from being undone by the Gaṅga prince Mārasimha. He was not only a general, but also must have been a good administrator. At the very outset he consolidated his position and his own newly won empire, before paying any heed to the murmurs and grumbings of the outside powers, who were at every moment threatening his position. At home he brought all the feudatory chiefs under his control and thus made himself care-free from within. Once he had established order inside the empire, he one by one met his enemies without and crushed them all.

Besides this glorious and brilliant part of his character, there certainly one finds some darkness enveloping it. However much

⁶⁶ *El.*, vol. XV, p. 349.

⁶⁸ *EC.*, vol. VIII, Sb. No. 445.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. III, p. 270.

his political character may demand commendation, the moral side deserves condemnation. His side may plead the necessity of executing Muñja as a state necessity, but even man of his own side can give no explanation for the barbarous treatment that was meted out towards that king. The barbarism becomes all the more brutal when one finds that the head of Muñja after his death was covered with sour milk. The body of a dead king was insulted. Muñja besides being a king, was a poet. Taila II could have easily spared his life, if not the liberty, for this consideration only. The reports of Mr̥ṇālavatī if he believed probably infuriated him, but still then Muñja had a sincere heart and the treachery was not his but Taila's own sister's.

The extent of the empire

Thus when Taila II closed his reign, he left to his successor a vast empire; on the south it included the Bellary district of the Madras Presidency, the Shimoga district and the northern part of the Chitaldrug district of the Mysore state; on the west, it was bounded by the ocean; on the north, it included Dharwar, Belgaum and Bijapur districts of the Bombay Presidency. The Cālukya empire also extended as far as the Thana district of the Bombay Presidency in the north. It included the whole of the Nizam's dominions; on the east, it was bounded by the Kistna river; on the north it extended beyond the river Godavari and commanded its influence up to Khāndeśa and Aurangabad districts in the Nizam's dominions which were governed by the Yādava Bhīllama II; and on the north-east, it extended upto the boundaries of the Warangal district in the Nizam's dominions.

II. *Satyāśraya (997-1008 A.D.)*

Taila II had two sons born from his wife Jākabba; the elder was named Satyāśraya and the younger Daśavarma.⁶⁹ Satyāśraya, pro-

69 *El.*, vol. VIII, pp. 16-17.

bably because of his seniority, succeeded his father on the throne in 997 A.D. His earliest known date from an inscription found at Hiri-Cavaṭi⁷⁰ is Śaka 922, Vikāri S. 999 A.D.

Satyāśraya is also called 'Sattiga'⁷¹ and 'Sattima'⁷² and like his father he adopted the biruda "Akalaṅkacarita Ṛivabedāṅga"⁷³ i.e. of spotless character and a wonder among those who pierce (their foes). He was also styled as 'Slayer of the Tamils'⁷⁴ He had other titles also which were adopted by Taila II.

War with the Coḷas

The most important event of his reign is the war with the Coḷas, who were already defeated by Taila II.

Uttama-Coḷa was succeeded by Rājarāja I, the Great. He was a powerful king and immediately after coming to the throne engaged the Ceras and the Pāṇḍyas in battle and inflicted crushing defeats upon them many times. After the Ceras and the Pāṇḍyas had submitted,⁷⁵ the Gaṅgas also met the same fate. These victories enabled Rājarāja to pay full attention towards the Cālukyas. Taila II had subdued the Ceras, Pāṇḍyas and the Gaṅgas before 995 A.D. and died in 997 A.D. A miscalculation of the capacity of the changed person on the Cālukya throne might have prompted the Coḷa king all the more to invade the enemy and after complete preparations he raided the Cālukya country. The Hottur inscription⁷⁶ refers to this Coḷa invasion. It states that Rājarāja Nityāvinoda Rājendra Vidyādhara, ornament of the race, Nurmudi Coḷa i.e. Rājarāja I invaded the Cālukya territory with a force of 900,000 men and pitched his camp at Dhanvūr, modern Donūr in the Bāgevadi Taluka of the Bijapur district, Nizam's dominions.

70 *EC.*, vol. VIII, Sb. No. 234.

72 *ML.*, pp. 87, 189.

74 *Ibid.*

76 *EL.*, vol. XVI, pp. 73 ff.

71 *EL.*, vol. VI, p. 330.

73 *EL.*, vol. XVI, p. 75.

75 Iyer—*H.S.A.D.*, p. 250.

The record further states that he devastated the whole country around his camp and slaughtered women and children and the Brāhmanas, whose young daughters he took away to become others' wives and thus destroyed their caste. This clearly shows that the Coḷa invasion had reached the heart of the Cālukya empire and the Coḷa king carried sword and fire, misery and destruction wherever he went. The whole country was laid waste and the Coḷa force insulted the women and were not even ashamed of outraging the modesty of young girls. It was after so much destruction had been done that the Cālukya force marched and drove the invaders away. The same record then states that the Cālukya Satyāśraya "drove away the Coḷa, captured his trains of baggage-waggons and made triumphal progress through the south."⁷⁷ This clearly indicates that the victory ultimately remained with the Cālukyas and the Coḷa king had to retire with heavy losses, with the Cālukya forces at his heels; but the Coḷa records even then claim victory for their king. A Coḷa record⁷⁸ states that "having returned after the conquest of Satyāśraya, he (Rājarāja I) worshipped the god by flowers of gold. This statement is corroborated by the Leydon grant, which also records a victory for the Coḷas over the Cālukyas."⁷⁹

What the results of the conflict were, it is difficult to conclude from these conflicting statements; this much is certain that the Coḷa king certainly had the advantage on his side in the beginning and defeating all oppositions he triumphantly marched towards the north. His object might have been to advance to the capital, but here he was checked. Satyāśraya descended from his capital with a powerful force and if not actually defeated the Coḷa king, at least he made him decamp. The Coḷa king for fear of being defeated, when his own forces might have been exhausted, left for his capital. In this hurried departure, it is very probable that some of the cum-

⁷⁷ *EL.*, vol. XVI, p. 75.

⁷⁸ *SII.*, vol. II, pt. I, p. 13.

⁷⁹ *ASSI.*, vol. IV, p. 204, 228; *EL.*, vol. XXII, p. 226.

bersome waggons of transport might have been left behind, which afterwards the Cālukyas captured. The Cālukya forces might have, it is probable, defeated the rear-guard of the Coḷa forces, which could not have followed the main force with the same speed. The Cebrolu inscription⁸⁰ dated Śaka 928 = 1006 A.D. found in the Guntur district clearly indicates the fact that the Cālukya emperor penetrated upto that part and that the Coḷa king's bid for conquest ended in failure and loss of territory.

As regards the date of the battle it may be pointed out that the Coḷa inscription, recording the incident, is dated in the 23rd year of the reign of Rājarāja.⁸¹ Rājarāja I ascended the throne in 985 A.D.⁸² and his 23rd year approximately would fall in 1008 A.D., but the date in the Cālukya record mentioning the same thing is 1006 A.D.⁸³ and so 1006 A.D. may be taken as the approximate date of the Coḷa invasion. No other political event of Satyāśraya's reign is recorded, except this Coḷa raid already described. His reign of about 11 years was peaceful, but at the same time uneventful.

Satyāśraya had one daughter named Vṛddhimabbārasi⁸⁴ and one son named Kuṇḍin or Kuṇḍirāja. The daughter was married to Iṛiva-Noḷambādhirāja of the Pallava family.⁸⁵ He was ruling Noḷambavadi 32000, Kongaḷi 500, Ballakuṇḍe 300, Kakkanur 30 and 5 towns within the Māsiyavāḍi province. Kuṇḍirāja⁸⁶ was ruling Banavāsi 12000 and Sāntaḷige 1000 in 1012 A.D. during the reign of Vikramāditya V.⁸⁷

He closed his reign in the year 1008 A.D. which is the last date of his reign recorded in the Munavalli Stone Inscription.⁸⁸

80 *IMP.*, vol. II, Guntur, No. 84.

81 *Ricc, Mysore and Coorg from inscriptions*, p. 87.

82 *El.*, vol. VIII, App. II, p. 22.

83 *El.*, vol. XVI, p. 75.

84 *SIEAR*. 1923, p. 101.

85 *El.*, vol. XVI, p. 30.

86 *Ibid.*, vol. XV, p. 329.

87 *EC.*, vol. VII, Sk. No. 287.

88 *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. II, p. 433.

III. Vikramāditya V. (1008-1013 A.D.)

Vikramāditya, son of the younger brother of Satyāśraya, ascended the throne in 1008 A.D.⁸⁹ He was the son of Bhāgyavati and Daśavarma.⁹⁰ Daśavarma did not succeed to the throne and the Kauthem grant states that Vikramāditya ascended the throne after Satyāśraya.⁹¹ It is very probable that Daśavarma died during the reign of the father or his brother. In the Kauthem grant⁹² Vikramāditya is mentioned as the son of Satyāśraya, but the Yewur tablet⁹³ mentions him as the son of Daśavarma, brother of Satyāśraya. This gross mistake can only be explained, as done by Dr. Fleet, by the fact that because of the early death of his father, Vikramāditya V was adopted as son by Satyāśraya and was made the heir-apparent. Satyāśraya himself had a son Kuṇḍirāja,⁹⁴ but probably because of his childhood, the throne passed to his uncle Vikramāditya V.

Vikramāditya V adopted Tribhuvanamalla⁹⁵ and Vallabhanarendradeva⁹⁶ as his biruda. His reign was quite peaceful. There is no political event recorded in the inscriptions. He maintained the empire intact, but from the inscriptions it can be gathered that complete incorporation of the Nolamba territory was effected during his reign though the beginning was made from the time of Satyāśraya. In the history of the incorporation of this province, a glimpse of the relations between the Cālukyas and the Coḷas can be gathered, hence, it deserves a careful consideration. Nolamba country was governed by a branch of the Pallavas. The history of the Pallavas is somewhat perplexing and complicated during the end and the beginning of the 10th and 11th centuries respectively. The relation of Irivanolambādhirāja, the Lord of Kāñci, a subordinate of the

89 *IA.*, vol. XVI, pp. 15 ff.; after July 26, 1008 A.D. which is the last known date of Satyāśraya (K.L.I.S.I., No. 148).

90 *IA.*, vol. VIII, p. 16.

92 *Ibid.*, vol. XVI, p. 19.

94 *EL.*, vol. XV, p. 329.

96 *IA.*, vol. XVI, p. 24.

91 *Ibid.*

93 *Ibid.*, vol. VIII, p. 16.

95 *EL.*, vol. XVI, p. 30.

Cālukyas as stated above, with that of the Imperial Pallavas cannot be traced out with any certainty. The main branch of the Pallavas came to an end in c. 900 A.D.⁹⁷ as a consequence of the defeat inflicted upon it by the Coḷa Āditya I as recorded in the Tīruvālaṅgādu⁹⁸ grant. Conjivaram or Kāñci, the capital of the Pallavas, was lost by the victors in about 947 A.D. after a sharply contested and hard fought battle between the Coḷa Rājāditya and the Gaṅga Būtuga.⁹⁹ The Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III became the lord of Conjivaram. It continued to be a Rāṣṭrakūṭa city till their overthrow by Taila II. After this the Pallava history is buried in obscurity. Several offshoots of the main line spread here and there and the Noḷamba-Pallavas were settled in the Noḷambavāḍi 32000 from which either they derived or the country derived the first syllable of their names. Noḷambapallava here probably means the Pallavas of the Noḷamba country as by Gurjara-Pratihāras is meant the Pratihāras of the Gurjar country(?).¹⁰⁰ These Noḷamba-Pallavas claim their descent from Trinayana Pallava. Simhapoṭa, the second prince of the house, was a subordinate of the Gaṅga Śivamāra. They continued to rule, sometimes as subordinates of the Gaṅgas and sometimes of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas,¹⁰¹ but this compulsion and the forced-yoke of dependency disgusted them. They probably began to contemplate in terms of rebellion during the time of Nanni-Noḷamba,¹⁰² This gave Mārasimha an opportunity to suppress them and he claims to have destroyed the Noḷambas and captured Noḷambavāḍi 32000.¹⁰³ As a result of this defeat they had to leave their country to save themselves from the Gaṅgas. One of the inscriptions clearly admits that they had to hide for fear of an attack by Mārasimha and they were much pleased when in 974 A.D. they heard the news of

97 *Hist. Sk. Anct. Dn.*, p. 70.

99 *El.*, vol. VII, p. 195.

101 Rice, *MCI.*, p. 55.

103 *El.*, vol. IV, p. 352.

98 *Ibid.*, p. 53.

100 *IHQ.*, vol. X, p. 338.

102 *Ibid.*, p. 55.

the death of Mārasimha.¹⁰⁴ Nolambavādi continued to be a Gaṅga principality till 985 A.D.¹⁰⁵ The Coḷa Rājarāja claims to have conquered the province before 1008 A.D.,¹⁰⁶ but the victory of Satyāśraya referred to in the foregoing pages over the Coḷa king deprived the latter of the province and the Nolamba princes who had by then formed a marriage alliance with the Cālukyas returned to their home province.¹⁰⁷

The last known date of Vikramāditya V as recorded in the Nellore Inscription is October 8, 1013 A.D., while the Karaḍihalli inscription records the date as December 29, 1012 A.D.

IV. Ayyaṇa II (1013-1014 A.D.)

Vikramāditya V was succeeded by his brother Ayyaṇa II sometime after October 1013 A.D.¹⁰⁸ The Yewur and Miraja inscriptions omit his name and state that Vikramāditya V was succeeded by Jayasimha II,¹⁰⁹ Bilhana states that Satyāśraya was succeeded by Jayasimha.¹¹⁰ According to Fleet¹¹¹ Ayyaṇa II did not reign. The earliest known date of Jayasimha II falls in the year 1015 A.D.¹¹² Thus there is a gap of about two years between the last and the earliest known dates of Vikramāditya V and Jayasimha II respectively. Many Cālukya records mention that Ayyaṇa, a brother of Vikramāditya V, reigned before Jayasimha II. Unfortunately no record of his time is discovered. The Balagāmve inscription dated 1075 A.D. records the genealogy of the Cālukya kings in the following way: "The extensive sway of the Cālukyas was glorious in the glory of Tailapa of unequalled strength, who was the prosperous universal emperor of the Cālukyas;—of Satyāśraya, who was the

104 Rice, *MCI.*, p. 57 (MB. 84).

105 Rice, *MCI.*, p. 57, (Sp. 59).

106 *SI.*, vol. II, p. 13; Aiyer, *Hist. Sk. Anct. Dn.*, p. 246; K. A. N. Shastri, *Coḷas*, vol. I, pp. 210-11.

107 *El.*, vol. XVI, p. 27.

108 *EC.*, vol. VIII, Sk. No. 471.

109 *IA.*, vol. VIII, p. 17.

110 Bühler, *Intro.* p. 26.

111 *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. II, p. 435.

112 *EC.*, vol. VIII, Sb. No. 16.

abode of fierce brilliance;—of Vikramāditya who was the receptacle of the quality of heroism;—of Ayyaṇa who was self-willed and haughty;—of Jayasiṃha who was impetuous.”¹¹³ Another inscription at the same place dated 1070 A.D. agrees with it but in it Ayyaṇa is designated as “a gainer of glory.”¹¹⁴ A third inscription at the same place records that “after him (i.e. Vikramāditya), his younger brother obtained it (i.e. the crown or the throne) with wide-spread fame as bright as the pleasant moon, emperor of world surrounded by the seven oceans. Ayyaṇa, the king’s younger brotherwas the king Jayasiṃha.”¹¹⁵ The Cikkamāgadi inscription¹¹⁶ dated 1182 A.D., the Vudri inscription dated 1139 A.D., the Bhārangi inscription¹¹⁷ dated 1159 A.D. and two inscriptions at Harihara¹¹⁸ agree with the above account. One inscription calls him Kṣītiśvara¹¹⁹ and many other inscriptions mention the same fact.¹²⁰ From these inscriptions, it is definite that Vikramāditya was succeeded by his younger brother Ayyaṇa II and we may conveniently place him in the gap of two years between the reigns of Vikramāditya V and Jayasiṃha II, though it may be less than two years. It is very difficult to say anything about his short reign. The statement of the Balagāmve inscription dated 1075 A.D.¹²¹ supplies us with the probable clue to solve this difficulty. It states that Ayyaṇa was “self-willed” and “haughty” and it characterises Jayasiṃha as “impetuous.” These epithets may lead one to suspect that probably Jayasiṃha applied violent means and overthrew his brother and this may account for the short duration of the reign of Ayyaṇa II.

S. L. KATARE

113 *IA.*, vol. IV, p. 208.

115 *EC.*, vol. VII, Sk. No. 123.

117 *Ibid.* Sb. No. 328.

119 *SIEAR.*, 1924-25, p. 75.

121 *Ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 208.

114 *EC.*, vol. VII, SK. No. 100.

116 *Ibid.*, No. 197.

118 *Ibid.*, vol. XI, Dg. Nos. 41 & 35.

120 *IA.*, vol. XLVII, p. 287.

The Talpurs of Sind*

IV. *Relation with the English*

The close of the 18th century and the dawn of the 19th was the most crucial period in the history of the English sovereignty in India. The race for power and authority between the English and the French was at its highest, and as appears from the correspondence of the Marquess of Wellesley,⁴⁶ the English were at that time much perplexed with regard to the French machinations in India. In order to win over the Indian princes to their side the French were directing their efforts to magnify the power, resources and success of France in the eyes of the Indians and of disparaging the force and credit of Great Britain by every possible means. The employment of the French soldiers at the courts of various princes was a menace to the British interests, for their forces tended to raise hopes of the princes, particularly those of Sultan Tipu. The task to which Lord Wellesley had set himself up was to crush and annihilate the French power in India so as to make a clear line for the British.⁴⁷

India was at that time also threatened by Zaman Shah.⁴⁸ As the Mahrattas looked to the contemplated invasion with alarm, they were anxious to enter into a defensive alliance with the English so as to oppose any such invasion if it took place.

Moreover the Home Govt. as well as the British Govt. in India were also apprehensive of an invasion of India by Russia, and

* Continued from p. 815, vol. XVI.

46 Edited by Mr. Montgomery Martin.

47 Letter No. 1 dated 23. 2. 1798 from Earl Mornington to Henry Dundas (edited by M. Martin).

48 Zaman Shah's letter to Tipu Sultan (from letter No. 18, vol. 5 of the collection by Martin).

they were bent on preventing any such advance at all costs. Their interest relating to the Indus (of which we shall speak later) was of course not merely commercial but it chiefly centred around the Russian menace. The following extract is significant.

"If ever Hindustan is invaded from the west the battle must clearly be fought upon the Indus and it would be a failure of common foresight, were measures not taken to ensure that the chiefs, States and tribes upon its banks should be unanimous and hearty in their exertions to repel the invader."⁴⁹

The interest of the English in Sind is thus understood. They felt it imperative that the activities of the Amirs of Sind, in so far as these related to their foreign connections, must be regulated with due regard to the wider interests of India. In passing it might be mentioned that when in 1713 negotiations were in progress for the marriage of the daughter of the Shah of Persia with the son of Mir Murad Ali of Hyderabad, the proposed match was viewed by the British Govt. as one calculated to serve political ends of a far-reaching nature inasmuch as, they believed, Russia would thereby be enabled to extend her sphere of influence in the East through the medium of Persia, in whose courts the former possessed ascendancy.⁵⁰ The Persians were regarded as the advanced guard of the Russians who, it was feared, would thus be brought into close proximity to the most exposed frontier of India. That marriage was eventually prevented through the influence of Ranjit Singh.

Early connections of the British with Sind

The connection of the British Govt. with Sind dates back to A.D. 1758 when Mian Ghulam Shah Kalhora granted permission to the East India Company to establish factories at Tatta and Auranga Bunder with a view to encourage trade between the Indian

⁴⁹ Princep, *Ranjit Singh*, pp. 171.

⁵⁰ Cap. Wade to Govt. dated 5. 8. 1831.

territories and Sind.⁵¹ He also granted to the Company certain immunities and exemptions from customs. Those factories were closed in 1775 owing to the hostile attitude of Sarfraz, son and successor of Ghulam Shah Kalhora. In 1799 Mir Fatch Ali Khan renewed certain privileges to British trade which he later withdrew, apparently at the instance of the Shah of Kabul. In 1809 owing to the machinations of Napoleon Bonaparte in Persia, an offensive and defensive alliance providing mainly for the exclusion of the 'tribe' of the French from Sind was negotiated at Hyderabad through the agency of Mr. N. H. Smith of the Bombay Civil Service, assisted by Lt. (afterwards Sir Henry) Pottinger almost simultaneously with a similar mission sent to Maharaja Ranjit Singh. In 1816 the English invaded and conquered Cutch from the Amirs whereby the relations of the two powers became strained with each other. The treaty of 1809 was later (in 1820) supplemented providing for the exclusion from Sind of the Americans also. In spite of their declared policy to avoid a war with the Amirs, the British Government were forced on two occasions in 1825 to assemble troops in Cutch to overawe them into the maintenance of these treaties and to prevent them from taking advantage of the English being at that time engaged in the Bharatpur and Burmese expeditions, for the Amirs were then suspected of contemplating the invasion of British territories or those of their allies.⁵²

Scheme of navigation through the Indus

In 1831 a present of five horses which was received from His Majesty the King of England for transmission to Ranjit Singh was sent to Lahore with Lt. (afterwards Sir Alexander) Burnes by the Indus with a view to the exploration of that river for studying possibilities of navigation. The authorities both in England and India

51 Ross, *The land of five rivers and Sind*, p. 5.

52 Burnes, 2.

were anxious to collect full and complete information, political and geographical, regarding that river, not only for the purposes of trade and commerce, but also for political objects alluded to above. This mission was met by the Amirs with a spirit of jealousy and fear of insincere designs on the part of the English. The Amirs hesitated to grant permission to Burnes for the use of Indus as his route, but Ranjit Singh gratuitously came to the rescue of Burnes in order evidently to make a gesture of reciprocity towards the British 'in advance' for the present which was shortly to be conveyed to him. A large force commanded by General Ventura (the French commander of the forces of Ranjit Singh) was sent to Dera-Ghazi Khan from where, due to its proximity to Sind, its presence was intended to intimidate the Amirs to allowing passage to Burnes.⁵³

The scheme of navigation of the Indus had been in contemplation as far back as 1809. When the treaty with the Amirs was renewed in that year a friendly relation was accordingly sought to be established with the ruler of Bhawalpur as a means of throwing open also the Satlej to the merchants of Central Asia and of Hindustan. The question of opening the Indus for this purpose was, however, actually brought forward only in 1832 when the Amirs of Hyderabad were persuaded through a series of negotiations to conclude a treaty on the subject. It was agreed by the Amirs that the Indus and the roads of Sind should be open to the merchants and merchandise of India subject to fixed duties. The treaty also provided *inter alia*, that no armed vessels should enter the Indus and that no English merchants should settle in Sind, their visits being subject to passports. A similar treaty was concluded with the Mir of Khairpur. Some modifications were made in the river dues by a subsequent treaty of 1832. It was provided in another clause of the treaty of 1832 that "neither of the contracting parties were to look

with an eye of covetousness on the possessions of the other." This part of the treaty was not destined to be fulfilled, as later events left the British Government with no choice but to intervene actively in the affairs of Sind and eventually to conquer it. How true were the fears of a Sayyad of Sind who had said on finding Burnes visiting the court of Sind—"Alas, Sind is now gone: the English have seen the river which is the road to its conquest!"

Intervention of the British in the affairs of Sind

In 1836, as mentioned before,⁵⁴ Ranjit Singh's armies invaded Sind and threatened Shikarpur claiming 12 lakhs of rupees as tribute. The Amirs had fully prepared themselves to give a befitting reception to the Maharaja's armies. But at this juncture the British intervened and compelled the Amirs to a subsidiary alliance with them. While on the one hand it was not consistent with the interest of the British Government that the Sikh power should extend along the banks of the Indus⁵⁵ and that it should command both the important frontiers of India, *viz.*, the Khybar and the Bolan; on the other, apart from political exigencies alluded to before, the co-operation of the Amirs was considered desirable in the British Govt.'s contemplated attack on Afghanistan which they were about to make through Bolan Pass in order to instal Shah Shuja on the Afghan throne. Col. Pottinger was accordingly deputed to visit the Amirs to urge upon them the necessity of restraining the Mazaris who were under their rule and thus to remove the immediate cause of Ranjit Singh's invasion, so as to render it easier and possible for Cap. Wade to dissuade Ranjit Singh from his contemplated projects.⁵⁶ He reached Hyderabad in November 1836 to negotiate a treaty with that end in view. He impressed upon the Amirs that in reference

54 *I.H.Q.*, vol. XVI, p. 815.

55 Govt. to Cap. Wade 26. 9. 1836 (*Punjab Government Records*).

56 Govt. to Col. Pottinger dated 19. 9. 1836 (*Punjab Government Records*).

to the dangerous position in which they stood it was imperative not only in their interests but for their very existence that the ties by which they were connected with the British empire should be strengthened.⁵⁷ The Amirs "protested, resisted and evaded"⁵⁸ but were compelled in their own interests to accept the British protection and subsidiary alliance. The agreement to this effect was arrived at in November 1936 between Col. Pottinger representing the British Government and Mir Nur Mohd. Khan of Hyderabad as representing the Amirs of Sind; this agreement was subsequently ratified by the Governor-General in Council.

The salient features of the treaty were:—

- (1) that an agent on behalf of the British Government with such guard as the Governor-General in Council shall deem proper shall reside at Shikarpur and be the medium of all communication between the governments of Hyderabad and Lahore and that one-fourth of the revenue of Shikarpur will be ceded for the expenses of the British agent;
- (2) that Sind will be protected by the British Government in the event of Ranjit Singh's persisting in his hostile attitude; and
- (3) that Nur Mohd. Khan will withdraw his wakil from Lahore and will be responsible for the acts of Khairpur and Mirpur States as well as for those of the Mazaris.

Mission to Lahore

Cap. Wade was on the other hand directed to proceed to Lahore (where he reached in the last week of December 1836) to persuade the Maharaja to withdraw his troops from the Sind frontier

⁵⁷ Govt. to Col. Pottinger dated 26. 9. 1836 (*Punjab Government Records*).

⁵⁸ Col. Pottinger to Govt. No. 127 of 1837 dated 4. 11. 1837 (*Punjab Government Records*).

in the interest of peace which it was imperative to maintain to ensure successful prosecution of their commercial scheme. He was also to announce to him that the Amirs of Sind had placed themselves under the British protection and that by persistence in his hostilities he would be running the risk of a conflict with the British Government.⁵⁹ Cap. Wade was also armed with powers "to pursue further measures to secure these objects should the friendly remonstrances.....not have the desired effect."⁶⁰

The Maharaja protested against the British interference in his designs and stated in defence of his invasion that he did so in retaliation for the aggression of the Mazaris and to punish the Sindhis for helping them. Ranjit Singh also observed that under the terms of the treaty of 1809:

- (a) his movements in respect of Shikarpur could not be restricted, since it lay beyond the river Satlej, and that
- (b) the British Government had no concern with territories other than those situated to the south of the river.⁶¹

These interpretations of the treaty were, however, held erroneous by the British Government, for as to (a) they contended that the barrier of the river Satlej could not be assumed to extend to the ocean, and as regards (b) they held that nothing more was stipulated than that the British Government should have no concern with the countries to the north of the river Satlej; and that of the other countries to the westward of the Indus, as for instance Shikarpur, no mention was made.⁶²

Cap. Wade found the Maharaja exceedingly unwilling to relinquish his projects on Shikarpur, perhaps because in the first place he had suspicions of the ultimate designs of the British Government in

59 Govt. to Cap. Wade dated 26. 9. 1836.

60 Cap. Wade to Govt. dated 10. 10. 1836.

61 Wade to Govt. dated 5. 10. 1836.

62 Govt. to Cap. Wade dated 14. 11. 1836.

Sind, and secondly because he feared to lose his prestige should he be obliged to concede to the British demands. Ranjit Singh, however, wisely grasped the situation and yielded to the representations of Cap. Wade although under protest, but he continued to hold Rojhan and the Mazari territory. He accordingly recalled Prince Kharak Singh who was directing operations on the frontier of Sind. His demand, which in these circumstances was obviously irrelevant for a heavy *nazrana* from the Amirs as the price of withdrawing his forces from around Sind, was rejected."³

*Beginning of active interest of the British in
Sind and Afghanistan*

For fear of Russia's designs on Afghanistan and eventually on India, Lord Auckland decided to take a bold step to instal a friendly king on the throne of Afghanistan. Such a man was ready at hand—Shah Shuja-ul-Mulk, who was an exile in Ludhiana. At that time Dost Mohd. Khan ruled at Kabul and other chiefs independently at Kandhar and Hirat. Shuja cordially agreed to co-operate in the scheme. A tripartite treaty was thus concluded among the British Government, Shah Shuja and Ranjit Singh. Maharaja Ranjit Singh's active interest in the affairs of Afghanistan was only gratuitous; still he thought it fit to join the expedition against Afghanistan. It was arranged that the Sikh forces should march on Afghanistan through the Khybar Pass while the British forces and Shuja himself through the Bolan Pass *via* Shikarpur, which was to be the military rendezvous, in spite of the treaty of 1832 with the Amirs of Sind. That treaty was temporarily suspended by the Governor-General in view of the special emergency. In Article 16 of the Tripartite treaty it was laid down that Shah Shuja-ul-Mulk agreed to relinquish for himself, his heirs and successors all claims of

supremacy and arrears of tribute over the country then held by the Amirs of Sind and which would continue to belong to the Amirs and their successors in perpetuity on condition of payment to him by the Amirs of such a sum in lump as might be determined by the mediation of the British Government, fifteen lakhs of such payment being made over to Maharaja Ranjit Singh in final settlement of his 'claims' on Shikarpur. The Amirs were informed of "the high importance to them of these measures and of the magnitude of the benefits they would derive from securing undisturbed possession of their territories, by paying Shah Shuja the reduced and reasonable claim upon them of twenty lakhs." In view of the fact that Sind had long since cast off the yoke of Kabul while Shuja had himself solemnly renounced all further claims on Sind, this sudden revival of an extinct demand, in the opinion of Cap. Wade, did not commend itself to the Amirs as an evidence of English goodwill. Not less untenable were the "claims" of Ranjit Singh on Shikarpur which the Amirs were now called upon to satisfy with cash payment. But all this was the price of weakness they had to pay—a much too common feature in the history of mankind!

The Amirs protested against the passage of the British army through Sind to Afghanistan, the temporary occupation of Shikarpur as a military base and the suspension of that part of the treaty of 1832 which forbade the transport of military stores by the Indus. They ultimately submitted and agreed to allow the passage of the British troops, but their governor of the fort at Manora, apparently under secret instructions from the Amirs, fired at the ship "*Wellesley*" as it approached Karachi. That last effort of the Amirs was of no avail as the British troops ultimately succeeded in taking military possession of Karachi. Simultaneously, however, the military stores accumulated at Hyderabad were destroyed and a severer

64 Report of Lt. Lewis Pelly regarding Khairpur State submitted to Govt. in March 1854. (*Bombay Govt. Records*).

treaty was imposed on them, by which the independence of each of the Amirs⁶⁵ was guaranteed only in consideration of payment of three lakhs of rupees a year towards the maintenance of the British force in Sind. Mirs Sobdar and Rustam Ali were exempted from any share in these payments in consideration of their friendly behaviour throughout.

The treaties with the Amirs of Sind were later subjected to varying interpretations by the British and the Amirs, and there had been difficulties in realising the tribute due under them. Lord Ellenborough, who succeeded Lord Auckland in 1842, withdrew the political officers who had been unable to solve the tangle and appointed Sir Charles Napier with supreme civil and military control to straighten the matters. Sir Charles's later policy appears to have been influenced by his strong desire to conquer Sind as evidenced by his well-known remark, "We have no right to sieze Sind, yet we shall do so, and a very advantageous, humane and useful piece of rascality it will be." How the crisis which culminated in the fateful battle of Miani was brought about is better related by the Sind Resident, Major Outram himself. "Prior to Sir Charles Napier's arrival" he says, "the princes of Sind had been treated with the consideration due to their rank and that demanded by their own ideas of propriety. No sooner did that officer arrive amongst them than all was changed. They were addressed in a tone of arrogant contempt which was as offensive as it was new and unexpected, and the conventional courtesies to which they had been accustomed were suddenly dispensed with. Rumour told them that we contemplated the siezure of the country and the sudden dismissal from office of the diplomatic body to which they had been accustomed, the imperious tone of the dictator who succeeded and the extensive military preparations which they beheld, all tended to convince them that

65 At this time Nur Mohd. Nasir Khan, Mohd. Khan and Sobdar were ruling at Hyderabad, Sher Mohd. at Mirpur and Rustum Ali Khan at Khairpur.

such was really our intention.”⁶⁶ In the words of his own brother, Major General William Napier, he further inflicted on them an entirely uncalled for “austere but timely and useful warning that the previous unsteady weak policy of diplomatic agents in Sind would no longer facilitate deceitful practices.” It is doubtful if this attitude and tone were authorised by the Governor-General.

The genesis of the war

Having given this warning, Sir Charles arrived at Sukkur and decided to enter into a new treaty in supersession of all previous ones. The necessity was dictated by the desire to secure greater advantages for navigation of the Indus, some modifications of transit duties and to overcome certain fiscal impediments to trade. The treaty was also intended to be in the nature of a punishment for the alleged hostile designs of the Amirs and their alleged intrigues against the British Govt. during the disasters following the invasion of Kabul.⁶⁷ Simultaneously armed preparations were openly set on foot. A new treaty was accordingly presented to the Amirs which demanded (1) cession in perpetuity of the towns of Karachi, Tattah, Sukkur, Bukkur and Rohri to the British, with a strip of land on each bank of the river, and of a large tract of country north of Rohri from Rohri to Subzulkot to the Nawab of Bahawalpur (from whom the Mirs had treacherously wrested it) as a reward for the former's faithfulness; and (2) the abolition of all tolls and transit duties of every kind throughout Sind. The terms dictated to the Khairpur branch of the family were the appointment of Ali Murad, younger brother of Rustum, to the *Rais-ship* in supersession of Rustum whose attitude was suspected to be hostile.

⁶⁶ *Gazetteer of Sind*, 125-26.

⁶⁷ That allegation is contradicted by Burton, *viz.* “During the fearful catastrophe which occurred at Kabul, the Sindhis and their chiefs took no part against us.....” (Burton, 31).

These terms were not acceptable to the Amirs, for they not only involved loss of large revenue owing to cession of important territories, abolition of duties, etc., but also the dignity and prestige of the whole Beluch tribe.

The Amirs were given very short time to consider the proposals, for a body of troops under Sir Charles was already in the field threatening to march on the capital in case of delay or evasion in signing the treaty. Major Outram who had left his political post on Sir Charles Napier's assuming the full control of Sind affairs had been recalled to Sind to assist in the negotiations. He had had a close experience of the intricacies of the politics of that country. The old Mir Rustum fled from Khairpur on the advance of the troops and was supposed to have entrenched himself in a small castle in the desert called Imamgur. On being pursued he left the castle for an unknown destination. Major Outram brought from the fortress the chief's son and a nephew, but no amicable settlement could be arrived at between them and Sir Charles Napier.

Sir Charles and Major Outram thus marched to Hyderabad; the latter was sent with a small party to the court of the Amirs on the 14th July, 1843. He compelled the Amirs to affix their seals to the draft treaty. They signed but on the understanding, which however could not be accepted by the British envoy Major Outram, that the question of the re-instatement of Mir Rustum would be considered favourably by the British Govt. Sir Charles, however, continued to advance in spite of the treaty having been signed. The Beluchis were now provoked beyond control, and had not the Amirs themselves conducted Major Outram and his party to the Agency, the infuriated Beluchis would have murdered them. The Beluchis wanted an assurance that Rustum would be restored his dignities or else they would lay down their lives, but such an assurance the Major was not empowered to give although he was personally sympathetic to this demand. Realising that they had got no hold on their men

the Amirs sent messages to the Major warning him of the danger and entreating him to flee from Hyderabad as expeditiously as possible.

Decisive battle at Miani and Nareja

On 15. 2. 1843 a body of Beluch cavalry at last attacked the Major in the Agency, an enclosed building on the eastern bank of the river. After a gallant defence he was compelled to retreat and rejoin the forces under Sir Charles Napier. On the 17th February the British forces marched on the capital and met the Mirs at Miani six miles from Hyderabad in the dry bed of the Fulali branch of the river. In that fateful battle the Amirs were completely defeated and put to flight with the estimated loss of about 5,000 men. The following day Mir Rustum Ali Khan, Mir Nasir Khan and Mir Husain Khan of Hyderabad—the specimens of fallen greatness—came into the camp of Major General Sir Charles Napier and unconditionally gave themselves up as prisoners of war.

To complete the conquest of Sind another decisive battle was yet to be fought; 20,000 Beluchis mustered under Mir Sher Mohd. of Mirpur and met the British force in Sind consisting of 5,000 men under His Excellency Sir Charles Napier (who had by that time been raised to the status of Governor of Sind) at a village called Nareja in Dabi near the Fulali—some eight miles from the town. The battle lasted for four hours. The Beluchis fought with courage and determination that is inspired with the consciousness of one's last chance to live or die, but fate had no better result in store for them than that witnessed at Miani. Sind thus completely passed to the sovereignty of the British on that day, memorable for the British and fateful for the house of the Talpurs!

From that period the only State in Sind that retained political individuality is Khairpur because of Mir Ali Murad's friendly conduct throughout the crisis. His right over the lands that were in his

possession at the outbreak of the war as a result of the transfer of the *Rais-ship* from Mir Rustum to him was recognised. Later, however, the validity of a certain treaty said to have been arrived at towards the close of 1842 between him and his brother Rustum came to be suspected.

Ali Murad's retribution

The treacherous attitude of Ali Murad had compelled the poor old Rustum to cede to him certain lands enumerated in the *Nownahur* treaty which was written in a copy of the Holy Quran. Ali Murad was suspected of having substituted one of the leaves on which the treaty was recorded and thereby of having fraudulently obtained possession of several large districts not contemplated in the original treaty. As entire Sind was now the lawful empire of the English except the portion held by Ali Murad, this action of Ali Murad was held to have amounted to treachery with the British Government. In 1850, accordingly, a Commission was appointed to investigate the charges brought against His Highness Ali Murad. The charges having been proved, Ali Murad was degraded from the rank of *Rais* and all his lands and territories excepting those hereditary possessions only which were allotted to him by his father, were annexed to the British empire.

He had usurped his good elder brother's turban and *Rais-ship*, betrayed his country, played an ignominious part throughout the crisis in Sind, and was overtaken in due course by a fit retribution!

V. *A general view of the administration of the Amirs'*

Civil and Criminal Justice

The country was divided into districts which were governed through *Kardars* who held charge of their respective districts and who were both revenue and judicial officers. Justice was administered in

large towns by *kotwals* and in villages by *kardars*. The law of the holy Quran was generally applied in cases expressly covered by it, but such cases were decided by *Qazis*, appeals from one to the other *Qazi* being permitted. The final appellate authorities were the Amirs. Cases of high crimes involving sentence of death or mutilation were also tried by the Amirs themselves. Murders, forgery and counterfeiting of coins were regarded as very serious crimes and were punished with flogging and imprisonment. The law of the *Quran* was not applied to the Hindus but they were allowed to settle their affairs by *Panchayat* which usually consisted of all the Hindus of the town with the *Mukhee* presiding, but they often selected a smaller number to investigate and decide a case.

The Amirs were temperamentally humane and wanted to rule in the true spirit of *Quranic* injunctions. There was complete absence of political assassinations as marked the rule in the neighbouring kingdoms, e.g. Afghanistan, the Punjab, etc. They were averse to capital punishment; mutilation was generally the last penalty, but even this could be commuted to long imprisonment. They had no regular system of jails, but the *kardar's* offices served as prisons. The higher class of criminals were sent to forts or confined in a *chaunkidar's* house. Other punishments given in the lesser crimes were fine, fasting, shaving, blackening of face and mounting the criminals on asses. For theft the punishment was according to Islamic law very severe, viz. mutilation or cutting of an arm, but this mode of punishment was actually not practised. Thieves were generally punished with disgrace; they were made to wander about the town with a ring of shoes and slippers hung around their neck. Thefts were not frequent as the Amirs had an efficient system of bringing thieves to book, e.g. liability for a theft lay on the door of the *zamindar* to whose village the footprints of the thief were traced and it was thus the personal interest of every *zamindar* and every village to see that thieves did not remain at large. Another check

which contributed to the curtailment of crime was that subsistence of the prisoners was the concern of their relatives or of public charity. In the case of theft of cattle four times the number of cattle was taken from the thief, three-fourths being taken by Govt. and the rest by the aggrieved party, evidently the intention being to suppress with strong hand the crimes calculated to interfere in the agricultural occupations of the country.

For adultery the punishment was prompt and severe indeed, *viz.* death, the executioner being the husband himself. A man was held justified in murdering both parties when he had cause merely to suspect a female relative of adultery. The Hindus did not, however, exercise this barbarous right on their women and were more humane and forgiving. The system of *Qisas* called "Diyat" in Sind generally prevailed, whereby a death sentence could be commuted by money payments if acceptable to the nearest relatives of the slain. Trial by ordeal was allowed when the prisoner pleaded not guilty and there was no evidence of his innocence.

Police

They had no regular police force except inadequately armed *sowars*; but there was not much need for them either, for every person was suitably armed and required no outside protection. Nor were their services necessary in rounding up the criminals since, as mentioned before, police duties devolved on the headmen of the villages in respect of culprits whose footprints were traced to their jurisdictions, the *sowars* and *kotwals* being merely required to co-ordinate their functions. This system proved so remarkably efficient that to whatever corner of Sind the culprits fled and in whatever place they took refuge it was impossible for them to evade arrest. "Thefts have been traced after an interval of time had elapsed and to the distance from the place of perpetration, almost incredible, through the running stream, over the newly ploughed field, through

standing corn, over the hard soil of the desert, through the crowded town, and along the high road the criminal was hunted down.”⁶⁸ Such an all pervading system of police administration and yet so economical was never heard of in the annals of Sind and indeed in those of the vast country of India.

The Jahangir-like impartiality and justice

The Amirs were at all times easily accessible to the public, as they had earnest desire that no injustice should be allowed to pass un-punished. They would, on receiving complaints, at once hold inquiries and redress all *bona fide* grievances.⁶⁹ In those times of difficult transport the governors of different towns generally exercised unbridled authority over towns committed to their charge, but the strict vigilance of the Amirs gave them little room for doing things with impunity. In the dispensation of justice the Amirs were impartial to all classes of their subjects, high or low, irrespective of caste and creed and they would not hesitate to punish even their governors if they were found to be oppressing their subjects. The governor of Karachi is once said to have ill-treated some of the lower classes of Hindus in connection with certain innovations which he wanted to introduce in the system of examination of merchandise at the bunder. The people having petitioned the Amirs, the governor was warned that on a further charge of that nature, if proved, he would be more severely dealt with.⁷⁰ On another occasion, probably in 1832, the governor of Karachi forcibly converted a young Lohani Hindu to Islam, whereupon the governor was summarily dismissed and the young man allowed to revert to Hinduism.⁷¹

68 Report dated 31. 12. 1847 from Lt. H. James to Govt. .

69 Postans 225.

70 Captain S. V. W. Hart's report to Govt. dated 28. 1. 1840 (*Bombay Government Records*).

71 *Ibid.*

The Amirs highly civilized

The Amirs were never cruel as is sometimes uncharitably alleged but were highly polished and civilized princes. They had at times to be arbitrary in view of the uncivilized state of society which often called for strong disciplinary measures, but this was an exception, not a general rule.⁷²

They were accused of having accumulated wealth by excessive taxation which is alleged to have resulted in misgovernment. Till Sind was annexed to the British empire, the English seem to have formed exaggerated estimate of the wealth and accumulations of the Amirs; for when, on the Amirs having surrendered, their treasury was taken possession of, the wealth actually found "disappointed all expectations."⁷³ Whatever riches they had possessed themselves of were not accumulated by excessive taxation, but by ordinary taxation and revenue which amounted to large sums owing to the most flourishing trade and commerce of some of the towns of Sind, viz., Karachi, Shikarpur etc., while on the other hand the cost of the administration was comparatively small.

Merits of their rule

As to the merits of the rule of the Amirs, Burnes would have us believe that a more barbarous and oppressive rule could not be imagined and that the Government of Sind was a "great misfortune of the people."⁷⁴ Postans remarks that "the whole system of government in its very plan and effect was barbarous, that the leading policy was to treat all other nations with jealousy and suspicion as likely to interfere with the selfish and exclusive order of things," that the Amirs pursued selfish policy and were apathetic to the general weal, that "trade and manufacture languished and the country with its great capabilities was sacrificed to misgovernment."⁷⁵ Such obser-

⁷² Postans, 229.

⁷⁴ Burnes, p. 63.

⁷³ See fn. 20 (vol. XVI, p. 806).

⁷⁵ Postans, 233.

vations are entirely one-sided as they lack corroboration from contemporary records—even of the English writers themselves! Postans' own views expressed on different occasions, probably in a sober mood, do not wholly confirm such extreme views. He admits that the "Amirs were not cruel but arbitrary and despotic."⁷⁶ Burton is of opinion that "atrocities were rare and justice was not severe."⁷⁷ There can be no better proof of their popularity and the contentment of their subjects than the fact that Sind had become singularly free from revolutions and intensive tumults to which it was for so long a prey during the rule of their predecessors.⁷⁸

Lt. James, reporting on the district of Chanduka in 1846 says:—"Thefts were scarce, much scarcer than they have been under British Government." He goes on to say that "the rule of the Amirs had the merit of strength; lawlessness and raiding were checked and life and property were secure to a degree which had been unknown probably for centuries."⁷⁹

Postans admits that with all the faults of the government of the Amirs "in many respects there was a total absence of the fierce, violent and brutal cruelty often exercised by the despotic princes of the East, whether Mohammadan or Hindu."⁸⁰ How far such sweeping observations about the merits of governments in the East can be regarded as sober facts of historical research is not my concern in this brief note, but it is evident from these observations that the charge of cruelty and extreme despotism levelled against the Amirs stands contradicted.

Comparison with the Punjab

In determining the merits of their rule, we are not to be guided by the modern methods of administration but by the standards that

⁷⁶ Postans, 229.

⁷⁷ Burton, 194.

⁷⁸ Postans, 195.

⁷⁹ Report on the Purgana of Chandookah in Upper Sind by Lt. H. James dated 31. 12. 1847.

⁸⁰ Postans, 342.

prevailed in other countries at the time we are speaking of. If we look to contemporary governments in some of the neighbouring parts of India, as for instance in the Punjab, the government in Sind at once comes into a happy relief. In the Punjab, which was then ruled by the Sikhs, the policy of the ruler was "that of an encroaching usurper and seizer of all within his reach, but what he so possessed himself of, he subjected to no systematic administration. The whole country was committed to farmers with full powers on the lives and property of the producing classes of the population There was no law, written or oral, and no regular courts of justice had been anywhere established. The civil government and the power of life and death in the provinces were in the hands of the *Sirdars*, *jagirdars* and renters..... The personal character of each individual *Sirdar* was thus the standard by which justice was measured."⁸¹

As against this, the Amirs had a regular system of law based on Islamic law and jurisprudence—a system which has been acclaimed to be perfect and flawless. Their method of dispensation of justice was provided with the usual checks and counterchecks in the form of appeals, the power of life and death being in the hands of the Amirs themselves, not in those of the petty chiefs. The fact that the Amirs were averse to extreme punishment constituted another check on the possible misuse of powers on human life. Postans had to admit—in an air of reluctance—that 'with due regard to the rude and uncivilized state of society we should not judge the Amirs too harshly and not condemn them.'⁸²

Charge of cruelty and inefficiency

At another place, Postans observes that "the Talpurs were certainly free from the charge of cruelty, and in this they deserve great

81 *History of the Punjab* II, 188.

82 Postans, 229-32.

credit considering their uncivilized position and absolute power over the lives of their subjects.....It is only astonishing.....that crime was comparatively so little rife in Sind.....and taking the extent of territory generally, the security for life and property was generally very great.”⁸³ It is true that in parts of the country coming within the range of unsettled and completely predatory tribes the inhabitants of Sind were exposed to constant trouble and insecurity, but this was confined to localities and was not the general rule.

Dr. J. F. Heddle in the course of his illuminating report to the Government strongly defends the government of the Amirs against charges of barbarism and inefficiency heaped on them with unsparing hands. He was definitely of opinion that the depressed state of commerce in Sind was not at all attributable to the Amirs, but were due to general causes which have been attended with similar effects in other countries. As regards the people of Sind he deplores that the critics should have so indiscriminately condemned the whole population. “The large masses of the population,” he says, “are particularly industrious.....the merchants of Sind are active and intelligent, well protected, though heavily taxed, by the Government but not so much as to prevent foreign traders to leave their native country and reside under the rule of the Amirs of Sind. Compared to any State between the Indus and the Euphrates Sind it may be pronounced as a country considerably advanced in civilization; the Government though severe is vigilant and well-ordered: too sensible of its own interests to ruin either the commerce or agriculture of the country. The people are orderly and obedient and the laws are respected.”⁸⁴ Major Outram was of opinion that ‘the Amirs of Sind were as men singularly free from the vices which prevail in Mohammadan communities (sic), more intellectual than their compeers in other eastern countries—temperate and strongly averse to

⁸³ Postans, 252.

⁸⁴ Memoir on the river Indus by Dr. J. F. Heddle, dated May, 1836.

bloodshed, affectionate, kind and gentle almost to effminacy. As sovereigns they were mild and little oppressive in their sway and ruled with an unity of design."⁸⁵ It is difficult to reconcile with these views the observations of Burnes that the Government of Sind was "a great misfortune of the people."

The civil administration of the country was thus as efficient and satisfactory as could be expected under the conditions then obtaining in Sind, and the Amirs cannot justifiably be subject to the charge of cruelty and misgovernment. But unfortunately there is much to be said against the defence policy of the Amirs.

Defence Policy

The otherwise well-ordered and efficient administration of the Amirs was marred by their extremely inadequate military resources which rendered them incapable to defend their country. Their military control very much resembled the feudal system which prevailed in England in early times. They had no regular army except personal guards consisting of not more than 150 half-drilled men drawn from every quarter of the East. When a war was imminent the Amirs would muster a force through their chieftains who used to supply a feudal soldiery or mercenaries, being bound to bring into the field, when required, a specified number of men in consideration and under pain of forfeiture of the *jagirs* granted to them. As is inherent in such a system the hold of the Amirs on the soldiery was not direct, nor were the chieftains quite amenable to the control of the Amirs, because the real sanction of force was actually at the com-

85 *History of Sind* vol. II, p. 286 (translated from Persian by Fredunbeg).

Note.—In spite of his impartial outlook in the affairs of Sind, Major Outram, like many other European writers, is unduly unfair in criticising rulers of Islam and identifying all human vices with them. Thereby they do more harm to their own reputation as writers of history than to the annals of the Islamic rule.

mand of the former. The political power was thus practically balanced on each side and the chieftains would naturally exercise not a little influence on the conduct of affairs of the State. Peace or war was more a question for the discretion of the chieftains than that of the Amirs. If the Amirs were actually not puppets in the hands of their chieftains, it was only because of a certain amount of sanctity attached to the office of the Amirs, for the Sindhis had great respect for the tenets of Islam which enjoins explicit loyalty to the "head of the State from amongst you," provided he does not transgress the principles of good government enjoined by Islam and which condition the Amirs entirely fulfilled.

The chieftains held direct control over their retainers who could be brought into the field at any moment. These men were in peace times employed in agriculture and other peaceful occupations. When they were brought into the field they were paid nominal pay ranging from Rs. 3/8 p.m. (for a foot soldier) to Rs. 30/- p.m. for a horseman.⁸⁶

The Amirs were averse to maintaining a standing army through a false sense of economy, even to the extent that they would be anxious speedily to disband forces assembled for special occasions and would thus deny their 'soldiers' even those brief opportunities to be imbibed with military training and discipline. That is why that when those soldiers were actually put to the hard test of a battlefield, they betrayed themselves as hopelessly undrilled and uninitiated into the regular methods of warfare. It is a sad commentary on the greatness of the Amirs and on their sense of foresight that even the unambiguous attitude of their political opponents who coveted their riches and their country did not inspire them with a sense of danger and the realisation of the need of adequate measures of defence. The too frequent threats of invasions by the Sikhs and the Afghans and the

⁸⁶ Burton, 242.

actual invasions of Shah Shuja had on the other hand the natural effect of demoralising the Beluchis and degenerating whatever militarism they had instinctively inherited. If only this brave nation of born soldiers—the Beluchis—were wedded into a regular military organisation and their martial qualities turned to useful channels suited to their temperaments and their habits they would have served the right purpose for which providence had evidently meant them. But the Amirs misadjusted their resources of men and money and got their inevitable reward—the loss of their kingdom!

MOHAMMAD YASIN

The North-West Frontier of the Sultanate during the 13th century

The physical features of India are such that the problem of defence is much minimised, it was more so during the early ages when scientific inventions had not provided mankind with so many instruments of destruction. The chain of continuous mountains in the north provided a natural boundary with a resistance which no human effort could subdue. Nevertheless the few passes in the north-west through which all the Indian races came, remained one source of constant danger. And thus the protection of the north-west became a problem to the emperors. That this problem of the frontier was one from the very beginning of Indian history cannot be denied. But it remains a surprising question that the Hindu kings, politically well versed as they were, totally failed to conceive the idea of the frontier defence in spite of repeated attacks from the same quarters. It remains to the credit of the Muslim sultans that they first of all realised the seriousness of the problem of frontier defence. However we do not find any attempt on the part of the Delhi sultans towards establishment of a scientific frontier as was done later on by the Mughal emperors.¹ By the term scientific frontier is meant the Kabul-Ghazni-Qundhar line flanked by the Hindukush mountains the strategic importance of which cannot be questioned; and the wide belt of land composed of the mountainous region extending from the north Kashmere to the sea coast inhabited by the ever-turbulent hill tribes and through which all the principal passes run. A strong and aggressive power like the Mongols established on the immediate frontier not only constituted a danger of supreme importance but also threatened the alien conquerors of

Delhi even if they were not attacked, with a far greater danger of being overwhelmed by the vast number of Indian population with the loss of all possibilities of retreat. Thus the problem of the frontier defence under the sultans was defensive actuated by the sense of self preservation and was different from that of the Mughals.

The question of the frontier really came into being when the kingdom of Ghor was broken up into fragments after the death of Muhammad bin Sam and India became an independent kingdom, while Khwarizmi empire annexed Ghazni and pushed its frontier upto the Indus.² Peshawar was the eastern frontier outpost of Jalaluddin Khwarizmi Shah³ when Chingiz Khan routed him in 1221 A.D. The ascendancy of Chingiz Khan changed the whole situation in Central Asia; Mongol out-posts were created at Ghazni in the Peshwar valley and other places in Afghanistan, and Indus no longer remained the political boundary. The frontier of the Delhi kingdom receded far into the interior of the modern Punjab.⁴ The tract known as the Salt Range formed a part of the unregulated land inhabited by the hill tribes known as Khokhars, Awands and Janjuhas,⁵ who were as lawless and turbulent like the frontier tribes of the present day.

During the early years of conquests Lahore and Multan were the westernmost provinces of Delhi. But Yaldūz occupied Lahore on several occasions,⁶ and for some time Lahore was equally claimed by Yaldūz, Qubacha and Iltutmish.⁷ Lahore occupied the strategic position and could easily destroy the flanks of army marching towards Multan, and at the same time it formed a suitable base for any expedition in the unregulated tract of the Salt Range.

² Raverty, *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, p. 267.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 285-93.

⁴ *Vide* Raverty, p. 239, note 5.

⁵ *Shabpur Settlement Report 1866*, pp. 27, 28.

⁶ Raverty, *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, pp. 526-530. Also Raverty, p. 526, note 8.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 530-31.

At this point a brief survey of the situation outside the borders of the kingdom of Ilututnish will be useful in explaining the condition and its effect. Jalal-ud-din not daring to encounter the hostile forces of Chingiz Khan fled towards Indian frontier, though overtaken and defeated, he managed to cross the Indus and entered Sind Sagar Doab. Chingiz Khan remained on the other side of the river and engaged himself in reducing the Ighraki sect of the Khiljis who were the allies of Jalal-ud-din and inhabited the northern regions of the river Kabul. It is also known how Ilututnish evaded the request of Jalal-ud-din for shelter at his court. Jalal-ud-din then turned towards Makhialah hills and from there he sent his general with a scanty force that he had gathered round him to raid into the territories of the Khokhar chief. The chief Rai Sangin submitted to him and gave his daughter in marriage and sent his son with a force to assist him.⁸ After thus buttressing his position Jalal-ud-din turned his attention towards the territories of Qubacha, which were in the west of the Delhi kingdom. Jalal-ud-din's general Uzbek Pai with seven thousand horse attacked Kubacha's camp in the night and routed him.⁹ Qubacha fled to Multan and readily complied with the demands of Jalal-ud-din which he made after reaching Uch.¹⁰ The stay of Jalal-ud-din was not long. Uzbek Pai was left in charge of the Indian possessions and Hassan Qurlugh over his belongings of Ghazni while he left lower Sindh by way of Mekran in H. 620 (= 1223 A.D.).¹¹ The effects of Jalal-ud-din's occupation and activities in the western Punjab were two-fold. First, it weakened Qubacha so as to be readily reduced by Ilututnish and secondly it exposed the boundry of Delhi to a heavy pressure of foreign raids.

8 Juwayni, *Tarikh-i-Jahan Gusha*, vol. II, p. 145; *IA.*, 1907, p. 3 also gives the traditional account of the marriage.

9 Juwayni, II, p. 146.

10 Juwayni, II, p. 147.

11 Ferishta, *Per. Text*, p. 315.

At this period and some time after, the frontier of Delhi kingdom extended to the Makhialah hills or Salt Range.¹² It seems that Nandnah¹³ must have been the fortress commanding the frontier. Along with Nandanah Kujah¹⁴ was another fortress in the Salt Range forming the frontier while Lahore was within the territory of Iltutmish. After the conquest of Lahore, Kujah and Nandanah had been placed under the charge of Malik Aitgin. The last expedition of Iltutmish in 1235 A.D. (=633H.) towards Baniyan¹⁵ occupied by the Qurlugh chief Saiful-din-Hassan, and the activities against the hill tribes of the Salt Range, indicates his policy of establishing a frontier.

At the time of Iltutmish's death the condition of the western frontier was no better than what it was when he ascended the throne. The annexation of the dominions of Qubacha brought the kingdom of Delhi directly in touch with the Mongol forces who were in occupation of the country west of the Indus. The situation became all the more precarious because of the weak successors of Iltutmish and general disturbance at the centre i.e. Delhi.

During the reign of Firoz in 1236 A.D. (=634 H.) Hassan Qurlugh made his first attempt on the Lower Sindh and attacked Uch,¹⁶ but he was repulsed and had to retract his steps across the Indus. Soon Hassan Qurlugh had to leave his original place again and come to India taking shelter in the Punjab, because in 1238 (=636 H.) the Mongols captured Karmān Ghazni and Baniyan.¹⁷ Upto the year 1239 A.D. the river Chenab seems to have been the

¹² Raverty, *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, p. 609 and note 3.

¹³ *Imp. Gaztr. of Ind.*, vol. XVIII, p. 349: Raverty, p. 534 note 1.

¹⁴ Raverty, *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, p. 629.

¹⁵ See Raverty, *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, p. 536, note; p. 541, note; p. 523, note, also notes on Afghanistan pp. 281-82: *Tab.-i-Akb.* (De.) p. 59 writes it Multan. But Baniyan undoubtedly lay west of Salt Range on the high road between Ghazni and Punjab. Baniyan and not Multan was the place, and rightly pointed out by De, *Tab.-i-Akb.*, p. 69, notes.

¹⁶ *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, (Per. Text) p. 237. ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 392. Raverty, p. 1129.

boundary line of the Delhi kingdom, as Malik Kabir Khan had to return from the river Chenab and submit to Sultana Raziya.¹⁸ This evidently shows that the land beyond the Chenab was not under them and Malik Kabir Khan had no other alternative but to submit to the queen, lest he should be overcome by the hostile Mongols.

In the year 1241 A.D. (=639 H.) Bahadur Tair the commander of the Mongols of Herat, Ghor, Ghazni and Turkistan appeared before Lahore.¹⁹ Malik Qaraqash Khan, the Governor of the town finding himself unable to withstand the Mongol onslaught, left the city and fell back towards Delhi. The city was completely destroyed and remained so till restored by Balban. The Mongols soon after evacuated the city leaving it exposed to the plunders of the Khokars. However Qaraqash Khan succeeded in driving out the Khokars from the province but we are not sure if he recovered the city. The frontier tract, because of the Mongol invasions, was in a state of utmost political confusion. In the north the hill tribes were practically independent and used to take advantage of the defeat of either party. The Khokars, Awands and Janjuhas occupied the northern portion of the Sindh-Sagar-Doab, and the Khokars even seem to have spread further east beyond the Beas, because we find them as forming a part of Raziya's army.²⁰

The province of Lahore with its dependency was later on during the reign of Masaud Shah reorganized and placed under Malik Uzbek-i-Tughril Khan.²¹ Henceforth it formed the frontier of the Delhi kingdom because we find that the army that at last set out from Delhi was despatched towards Lahore, "to guard the frontier."²² Thus the boundary line of the Delhi sultanate had receded and the river Ravi roughly formed the inner line of the frontier province.

18 *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, Per. Text., p. 235.

19 *Ibid.*, pp. 392, 393. Raverty, pp. 1129-32.

20 See Raverty, *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, p. 647, note 9.

21 *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, Per. Text., p. 262.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 195.

The boundary line had receded in Sindh as well. Malik Kabir Khan the Muquti of Multan asserted his independence immediately after the departure of the Mongols and seized Lower Sindh, in the year 639 H. After his death his son Taj-ud-din Abu Bikt became the ruler and repulsed several times the attacks of Hassan Qarlugh.²³ Uch was held by the general of Malik Kabir Khan.²⁴ But Malik Kabir Khan's dynasty soon came to an end after the death of his son. In the year 643 H. (= 1245 A.D.) the Mongols under Mangutah invested Uch, and the citizens had to send a deputation to Delhi for help. The royal forces under Ulugh Khan speedily marched to their assistance. The Mongols, finding themselves weak, withdrew from Uch. Ulugh Khan then proceeded to chastise the hill tribes of Jud, but had to return after he had reached the Chenab because of the disturbance and deposition of Masaud Shah. It seems that the aim of Ulugh Khan was to recover Nandanah in the Salt Range because raids and plunders were carried on in the neighbourhood during the expedition. But the tract beyond Ravi could not be reconquered and for the time being remained in a condition that might be termed as Mongol sphere of influence.

During the invasion of Sali (about the year 1246-47) the Governor of Lahore had to purchase his safety²⁵ and it seems that he accepted the Mongol suzerainty and payment of a tribute, and went out of the authority of Delhi sultanate because *Minhaj-us-Siraj* remains silent about Lahore till the year 1254. Shortly after in 1249 Hassan Qurlugh appeared before the walls of Multan then held by Malik Kashlu Khan, who hastened from Uch for its defence. Though Hassan Qurlugh was killed in action Malik Kashlu Khan had to evacuate the city.²⁶ After a short time Sher

²³ *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, Per Text. p. 399.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 287.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 277. See also Raverty, p. 677 note 6.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 270.

Khan,²⁷ the Muquti of Bhatinda recovered the city and placed it under his naib Malik Kurez.²⁸ Sher Khan also snatched away Uch from Malik Kashlu Khan²⁹ in 1250 A.D. (=648 H.). But on account of the Hindu reaction³⁰ in the centre headed by Imad-ud-din Riyhan, his possessions in Sindh were transferred to Arslan Khan³¹ in the year 1253 A.D. (=651 H.), and Sher Khan retired to Turkistan and went to the court of Mangu Khan.³²

Jalal-ud-din, brother of Mahmud, who was appointed Muquti of Sambhal and Badaun in 1248 A.D. (=646 H.³³) suddenly left for the Sirmur hills.³⁴ Lahore at that time was outside the empire and Ulugh Khan's expedition towards the "upper provinces and banks of Beas"³⁵ could not have been without any connection with the flight of prince Jalal-ud-din. Jalal-ud-din fled to the court of Mangu Khan in 1253 A.D. (=651 H.) and sought his help, and returned with Sali Bahadur and others.³⁶ Jalal-ud-din seems to have held Lahore under Mongol protection, and he joined the Balbanites against the Riyhanis and appeared from the side of Lahore and joined the camp at Bhatinda.³⁷ Later on some reconciliation was effected between Jalal-ud-din and the sultan Nasiruddin,³⁸ but this did not mean addition of Lahore to the Delhi kingdom.

It should be noted at this stage that the boundary of Delhi empire by this time had much receded from the Ravi and shortly

27 See Ferishta (Lucknow Text), p. 125.

28 *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, Per. Text, p. 277.

29 *Ibid.*, pp. 214, 271.

30 By Hindu reaction I mean the attempt of the converted Muslims to ascertain their position which was organized under the leadership of Imad-ud-din Riyhan.

31 *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, Per Text, pp. 217-218.

32 *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, Per. Text, pp. 217, 277; Raverty, notes p. 792: *Tab.-i-Akbari*, p. 75. Badauni, vol. I, p. 91. Raverty, p. 1225, mentions the fact, that the arrival of Sher Khan at the Mongol court in 1254 is mentioned by the Christian missionary Rubruquis.

33 *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, Per. Text, p. 212. 34 See Raverty, *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, p. 684.

35 *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, Per. Text, p. 292. 36 Wassaf.—Elliot, vol. III, pp. 37, 38.

37 *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, Per. Text, p. 300. Raverty, p. 830. Notes 4 & 5.

38 *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, Per Text, p. 219. Raverty, p. 700.

after, river Beas³⁹ is mentioned as the frontier. The province of Bhatinda which had been conferred again on Sher Khan, and the river now decidedly formed the north-west frontier boundary of the Delhi empire. Moreover we see that the Mewati trouble could not be subdued in 658 H. owing to the Mongols having appeared on the frontier of Delhi who continued to harass the frontier tracts of the dominions of Islam namely the territory of Sindh, Lahore and river Beas.⁴⁰ Lahore and Sindh both at the time were not within the jurisdiction of Delhi kingdom. At this time Sind was held by Kashlu Khan as a protégé of the Mongols,⁴¹ and Delhi Sultan at this period being not prepared to incur the displeasure of the Mongols had to transfer Sher Khan—because of his hostile attitude to Kashlu Khan—from Bhatinda to Kol Gwalior and other provinces in 1258 A.D. (= 657 H.) in order to avoid strife on the frontier,⁴² and Malik Nasarat Khan was placed in charge of Bhatinda, Sunam, Samana and Lakhawal and the frontiers as far as the ferries over the river Beas.⁴³

By the time Balban came to the throne he had improved a great deal the condition of the north-west frontier. Malik Sher Khan had again been given the charge of Sunam, Bhatinda, Lahore and Dipalpur. He built the fortress of Bhatner and effectively resisted the Mongols. He maintained a well-equipped army of several thousand horsemen and not only effectively resisted the Mongols but thoroughly suppressed the Jats, Khokars, Mandahirs along with the Bhatīs living in those unregulated tracts.⁴⁴ Early in his reign Balban led expeditions into the Salt Range and two years later proceeded to Lahore, rebuilt and repopulated it and

39 Beas flowing in its own bed before the Sutlej joined it from the east. *Vide IA.*, 1932, pp. 168-69 "River courses of the Punjab and Sind" by R. B. Whitehead, *IASB.*, 1886, pp. 322-343. "On probable changes in the geography of the Punjab and its rivers" by R. D. Oldham.

40 Raverty, *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, pp. 850-51.

41 *Tab.-i-Nasiri*, Per. Text, pp. 273, 310, 322.

43 *Ibid.*, p. 274. See Raverty, p. 788 notes.

42 *Ibid.*, p. 278.

44 Zia., p. 65.

appointed new officers for its administration.⁴⁵ But it seems Lahore was once more lost because it is not mentioned any more; and when Balban arranged the frontier and distributed the outposts Lahore is omitted. Sindh must have been recovered by Balban because a few years after his accession, he placed Sind with Uch and Multan as a outpost under Prince Muhammad, and who effectively resisted the Mongols.⁴⁶ Amir Khusru mentions Afghan garrison on the outlying fortress of the province where the Prince, with whom the poet lived, used to spend some time during his yearly campaigns against the Mongols. After Sher Khan's death in 1271 A.D. the frontier province was divided and several officers were appointed, but they were no match for the Mongols and they never attained the same degree of success as was achieved by Sher Khan⁴⁷ and Punjab remained quiet in a disturbed territory. The frontier line in the Punjab again receded, because we find that Bughra Khan was appointed to the province of Sunam and Samana⁴⁸ and was instructed to increase the number of soldiers and to keep them in readiness, beyond this the accounts do not refer to any land. Thus Sunam and Samana seems to have been the frontier provinces. Against the Mongols who came beyond the Beas, Balban sent the martyr Prince from Multan, Bughra Khan from Samana and Malik Barbak Bektars from Delhi. They marched to the Biah (Beas) driving back the Mongols and obtaining many victories over them so that the enemies were unable to advance beyond the Biah.⁴⁹ Thus it is clear from the above that the real hold of the Delhi sultanate was up to the river Beas and any attempt of further encroachment or advance on the part of the Mongols was effectively checked. Safely therefore we can conclude that Beas roughly formed the boundary in the Punjab.⁵⁰

45 Zia., pp. 60, 70.

46 *Ibid.*, pp. 66-69.

47 *Ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

48 Elliot, III, p. 111.

49 Zia, p. 81. Elliot, III, p. 112.

50 Beas at that time had a different bed from that of to-day. The name wherever it occurs in this paper refers to the old bed; see note 37.

The Mongols continued to disturb the frontier and in the year 1285 A.D. (=684 H.) Samar Khan⁵¹ came with a force of the Mongols and in the battle Prince Muhammad was slain and Amir Khusru was taken prisoner. After the death of the martyr Prince Balban gave charge of Multan and the province of Sind to Kai Khusru.⁵² Balban in this appointment showed his weakness for his relatives, because the prince was young and certainly not a match for the task entrusted to him. But Kai Khusru continued at Multan till he fell to the conspiracies of Nizam-ud-din and was murdered in the town of Rohtak.⁵³ During the weak reign of Kaikubad the frontiers seem to have been neglected. Sind remained in a disturbed state. The intention of Kai-ku-bad to send Nizam-ud-din to Multan to check the disorder prevailing there—after his return from the interview with his father—was baffled as the latter declined from going there.⁵⁴

Jalal-ud-din Khilji was in charge of the Punjab frontier during the latter portion of the reign of Kai-ku-bad but he does not seem to have recovered any more ground because when he is mentioned to have come to Delhi, he was governor of Samana.⁵⁵ Thus Samana and Sunam remained as the frontier provinces with the western boundary roughly corresponding with the river Beas and Dipalpur on the bank of the Beas must have been the outpost. Amir Khusru in *Qiranus Sadain* mentions that when Tamar Khan led the Mongols and overran the bank of Ravi extending from Lahore to Multan,⁵⁶ Malik Bektars was sent with a force of three thousand and routed the Mongols on the bank of the Ravi and made a large number of prisoners.⁵⁷ But this passage evidently refers to the early period of the short reign of Kai-ku-bad. Because later on Jalal-ud-din

51 Zia., p. 110.

53 *JASB.*, 1871, pp. 189-90.

55 *JASB.*, 1871, p. 215.

57 *Ibid.*, p. 50; *Tarikh-i-Mubarakshahi*, p. 54.

52 *Ibid.*

54 *Ibid.*, p. 214.

56 *Qiranus Sadain*, p. 49.

Khilji was in charge of the frontier where he showed his mettle as a soldier.

Thus the north-west frontier—except for a brief period of Iltutmish's reign—throughout the so-called Slave dynasty remained between the river Ravi and Beas; and the water parting line of the two rivers roughly formed the boundary line of the empire, with the utmost expansion upto the left bank of the Ravi in certain periods. While the river Beas was within their territory the river Ravi was not, because as is evident from the various incidents quoted in this paper, whenever the Mongols crossed the Beas or attempted to cross, the Imperial army or the Governor in charge pursued them crossing the river but they hardly ever crossed the river Ravi in the pursuit of the enemy; and Lahore on the left bank of the Ravi must have occupied an important position along with Multan. Samana, Sunam, Dipalpur, Lahore, etc. were then frontier provinces and none of them are situated beyond the Ravi. Thus it is certainly erroneous to assert Peshawar as the frontier boundary of the Delhi empire in the 13th century. Peshawar was quite outside the jurisdiction of the Slave kings.

The so-called Slave rulers were never able to achieve a natural frontier from where they could ward off the foreign invaders i.e. the Mongols. The western Punjab was either in a no man's land or was within the Mongol sphere of influence. Then western Punjab being outside the pale of the Indian Empire, the Slave rulers with all their precautions could not prevent the Mongols from entering in their land and becoming a menace to them; and therein lies the chief clue for the repeated attacks of the Mongols and their march at times right up to Delhi in spite of the fact that they were never strong enough either to defeat the sultan or to stay in India.

Somatism of Vedic Psychology

Manas is the human faculty which is usually associated in the Veda with a variety of psychological activities. The consideration of the genesis of the Vedic conception of *manas* brings forth a number of unique characteristics of that human faculty. Let us approach the question of the origin of the conception of *manas* from the philological point of view. It is believed by some scholars that the words, *manas*, *manus*, *manyu*, *mensch*, *mann* etc. are derived from the Indogermanic root °*men*—which has the sense of ‘thinking’, ‘mental activity’ etc. The possibility is hereby suggested of the notion of man as a ‘thinking being’, being prevalent in such a remote period. The anthropological investigations have however led to a doubt as to whether the proposed etymology is correct. The idea of man as a ‘thinking being’, as against beasts and other creatures, who are supposed to have been denied the faculty of thinking, cannot possibly have prevailed in that age. The primitives usually do not believe in any kind of essential differentiation among the several aspects of creation, whose existence was, according to them, wholly dependent upon a universal all-penetrating fluid like *Aronda* or the Vedic *asu*¹. It was the amount of such occult fluid, and not the possession or non-possession of any special mental or physical faculties, that determined the gradation among all beings in the universe.

There is another fact to be noted in this connection. A fair knowledge of human anatomy on the part of the Indogermanic people has given rise to a large number of words denoting several parts of the human body, which are to be found in many Indogermanic languages and which are linguistically connected with one another. It may be further observed that the words, in several In-

1 Vide Dandekar: *Der vedische Mensch* (Heidelberg), p. 28.

dogermanic languages, denoting 'sensations', 'emotions' and other such non-physical (or psychological) phenomena are connected with the names of bodily organs. In Homeric language, for instance, *ζρηθ*, *ζρενες*, *πρχιπιδες* (connected with diaphragm) denote almost all the faculties of will, thought, understanding etc. Further it is not unlikely that the words *χολος* (anger), and *χερδος* (advice) and *χερδούση* (cunning) are connected with *καρδια* (heart). In later Greek, the entrails seem to be regarded as the seat of feelings and sensations (cf. *δπλαγκνιζομαι*). The Latin words, *vecors* (wrong-sensed), *recordari* (remember) etc. indicate that those faculties were again connected with *cor*, *cordis* (heart). In the Slavonic languages, particularly in Russian, anger and excitement are associated with liver. These linguistic facts show that many words denoting non-physical or psychological phenomena were derived in most Indogermanic languages from the names of different bodily organs. They were not at all connected with *manas* or its linguistic counterparts in other languages. The association of *manas* with human psychology is therefore clearly an afterthought.

How then are the words *manas*, *manus*, etc. to be derived? It has been suggested by Güntert² that these words may be regarded to have been originally Indogermanic loan-words; they are the Indogermanic counterparts of the primitive word *mana*, which denotes the universally permeating fluid which, according to primitive notions, makes all beings what they are. This fluid *mana* was further supposed to be capable of bestowing upon beings some kind of occult power which made them 'men'. It may therefore be assumed that the words *manas*, *manus*, *man*, *mensch* etc., in the individual Indogermanic languages, have come into existence as the result of the influence of primitive thought upon those peoples. Those words did not originally denote exclusively psychological or

2 Vide Dandekar: *Der vedische Mensch* (Heidelberg), p. 42.

non-physical notions. *Manas*, for instance, did not originally denote what we today call 'mind'—that was a later modification of the original conception—but it denoted a comprehensive all-penetrating fluid or occult power like *mana* of the primitives. *Manas* was therefore regarded to be as much 'material' in nature as *mana*. This original notion about *manas*, as a form of 'matter', has been preserved, to a considerable extent, in the Vedic literature, even after *manas* came to denote human mind. It is this phenomenon in Vedic psychology which I have called 'Somatism of Vedic Psychology'.

In a hymn (*RV.* II, 12, 1), the God Indra is called *manasvān*. This epithet does not indicate, in this context, the possession on the part of Indra of any special 'mental' power. The poet merely wants to bring about the contrast between *manasvān* Indra—Indra who possesses large quantity of 'manas-substance'—and *asura* Varuṇa—Varuṇa who possesses large quantity of 'asu-substance'. The words *manasyu* (*RV.* X, 171, 3) (one desirous of 'manas-substance'), and *manasapati* (*AV.* VII, 97, 8) (one who commands any amount of 'manas-substance') are also to be explained as belonging to the original 'mana-manas-conception'. Other significant passages, in this connection, are the funeral hymns (*RV.* X, 57, 3; X, 57, 5. *AV.* VIII, 1, 7; VIII, 1, 15; VIII, 2, 3). In all these passages, *manas* denotes a dualism with the physical body, not in the sense of 'cogitatio' and 'extensio', but in the sense of a 'potence-bestowing substance' and its 'substratum'. The loss of *manas* (not evidently in the sense of 'mind', but in its original sense of *mana*-potence) results in virtual death. It is in its original sense, again, that the Vedic poet speaks of the bestowal of *manas* on beings (*RV.* V, 57, 3-5). A critical comparison of such references to *manas* in *Rgveda* (particularly X, 57 and X, 58) with the references to *manas*—in its modified form—in the *Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā* (XXXIV) clearly brings about the distinction between the two notions denoted by the word *manas* in the Vedic literature. In the former we have the original 'mana-

manas-connection', while the latter passage is one of the finest descriptions of the faculties of the human 'mind'.³

The fact that *manas* originally represented some form of 'material substance' is further amply corroborated by the Vedic descriptions of the several activities of *manas*. *Manas* is often represented as being capable of such physical modifications as are usually associated with 'matter'. *Manas* is, for instance, considered to be capable of movement in space. It is always said to be moving from place to place. No function of *manas* is possible without some movement on its part. There are prayers in *R̥gveda* for *manas* to move in a particular direction and come nearer to the poet: *devāścid manasā sam hi jagmuḥ* (III, 1, 13), *prācīnena manasā barhaṇāvātā* (I, 54, 5), *arvācīnam su te mano grāvā kṛnotu vagnunā* (I, 84, 3). The 'motion' or 'movement' implied in the functioning of *manas* can also be realised from such passages as *mano dānāya codayan* (VIII, 99, 4), *bhadram no api vātaya manah* (X, 20, 1), *parā hi me vimanyavaḥ patanti vasya iṣṭaye* (I, 25, 4). This notion of *manas* leaving its substratum, viz., the physical body, and going forth to the object of comprehension has been developed into a remarkable feature of the later Indian epistemology. Modern science holds that the external objects, in the form of light-rays etc. issuing from them, go up to the human senses. Indian theories of knowledge, on the other hand, maintain that *manas* and *indriyas* went forth to the objects of perception and conception. This doctrine is known as *indriyāṇaṃ prāpyakāritā*.

A similar feature of *manas* is indicated when the poet speaks of 'turning' the *manas* of the divinity: *nū indra rāye varivaskṛdhi naḥ ā te mano vaurtyāma maghāya* (VII, 27, 5). There are further

3 How the conception of *manas* as 'mind' evolved from the primitive '*mana-manas* conception' is an interesting problem of Vedic psychology. It is however beyond the scope of this paper.

references to the 'placing' of *manas*: *tve pito mahānām devānām manaḥ hitam* (I, 187, 6), *mano yatrā vitad dadbuh* (VIII, 13, 20). There are also references to the 'yoking' or 'binding down' of *manas*: *yuñjate mano dānāya* (I, 48, 4), *manasaḥ na prayuktiṣu* (I, 151, 8), *apo acchā manaso na prayuktiḥ* (X, 30, 1). A more intensive form of this function of *manas*, which is clearly indicative of its 'material' nature, is suggested by the 'grasping' of and by *manas*: *sveneva dhīro manasā yadagrabbīt* (I, 145, 2). Further *manas* is described as being 'controlled', 'bound down', 'driven from afar' etc. (VIII, 11, 7).

The Vedic poets further speak of the 'tension' of *manas*—another feature which indicates that *manas* was regarded as a 'material substance.' It could be "loosened": *vi mṛlikāya te manaḥ rathir aśvam na śanditam, gīrbhir varuṇa śimahi* (I, 25, 3). *Manas* becomes 'hard' and can be 'softened': *pañēścid vi mradā manaḥ* (VI, 53, 3). In such passages, there is a clear indication of the Vedic conception of *manas* being capable of 'thickening' or 'solidification.' *Manas* 'binds' down others (I, 164, 37) and can itself be bound down by external forces (I, 138, 1). *Manas* is said to 'shake' through fear (X, 121, 6). There is further a reference to the 'churning' of *manas*: *evā mathnāmi te manaḥ* (AV. II, 30, 1), as well as to 'controlling' or 'disciplining' it (VIII, 33, 17). The functions and the activities of *manas* are so described in the Veda as if *manas* were actually a 'material substance' and its activities actual modifications in the nature and position of that substance. The word *pāka* usually employed in connection with *manas* (X. 28. 5; X. 114. 4; VII. 104. 8; X. 2. 5) also brings forth prominently the 'somatic' nature of *manas*. *Manas* was a kind of 'matter' which was subject to being 'ripened' or 'cooked.' Such descriptions may not be explained away as mere imaginative or poetical representations of the activities of *manas*. They clearly betray the original 'somatic' nature of *manas*. *Manas* must have been regarded as a kind of

'matter' and its activities were therefore necessarily described as mechanical and dynamic modifications of that 'soul-matter.'

This feature of Vedic psychology was continued even in later philosophical systems. The *Chāndogyopaniṣad* declares that *manas* was, for its formation, dependent upon alimentation. The *manas* is said to be manufactured out of the food that we eat: *annamayam hi somya manah* (C.U., VI, 5, 4; VI. 6, 1-2). Though all later Indian systems of philosophy, with the exception of the Cārvākas, who believe that 'consciousness' originates as the result of the gross material elements coming together, regard *citta* or *viññāna* as something peculiarly psychical, it must be remembered that the nature and the activities of *citta* are represented by them in a manner as if it were a material substance. Even later, Indian psychology is thus primarily 'somatic' in character. Such is the case particularly of Buddhist and Yoga psychological teachings. In *Abhidhamma*, for example, all elements are graded according to their grossness—from the grossest earth to the subtlest soul-matter. The Buddhist psychologists speak of six *dhātus* and five *skandhas*, which terms again betray their 'somatic' nature. All consciousness-phenomena, like feelings, emotions, perception and conception, knowledge etc., are regarded in Yoga merely as disturbances in or modifications of the psychical substance. According to Yoga-psychology, *manas* is *pariṇāmi*, that is to say, it is constantly suffering a thousand modifications. The terms *vṛtti* and *pravṛtti* are clearly indicative of this feature. *Vṛtti* means the activity of an object; *pravṛtti* means the going forward of the *citta* towards its object. *Dhāraṇā* means literally the binding of *citta* to the desired object; *dhyaṇa* is explained as the homogeneity of the stream of consciousness. The stream of consciousness is not a metaphorical imagery but it is a real flow of the waves of *citta*. The first type of 'disturbances' in the psychical matter is, from the 'somatic' standpoint, that of 'movement, vibration or oscillation'. The second type is that of 'solidification or thicken-

ing,' which is indicated by the gradation made by the Buddhists—*yathaudārikam*—of the four psychological *skandhas*, namely *viññāna*, *samskāra*, *vedanā*, and *saṃjñā*. The third type of 'disturbances' in the soul-matter is that of 'defilement or affliction.' This is indicated by the notions of *kleśa*, *āsrava*, and *prasāda*. According to the bhāṣya on *Yogasūtra* II. 11, the *citta*, when defiled and afflicted through *kleśa*, is to be treated in the same manner as a dirty cloth. The *Yogācāra* school of Buddhism, represented by Maitreya Aśaṅga, believes in the divisibility of *citta*. All these conceptions in later Indian psychology clearly remind one of the descriptions of *manas* and its activities in the early Vedic literature.

It will thus be seen that the 'somatism' of later Indian psychology may be traced back to the conception of *manas* in the Vedic literature. *Manas* in Veda, like *citta* of Yoga and Buddhism, was regarded as a form of material substance, which underwent mechanical and dynamic modifications thus causing several so-called psychical phenomena.

R. N. DANDEKAR

Defence of Patna against the apprehended Pindari Incursion of 1812

In my paper entitled the *Defence of the Frontier of Bihar and Orissa against Maratha and Pindari Incursions (1800-19)*,* I gave a brief account of the precaution taken to defend the city of Patna, based on some unpublished letters from the records of the Judge-Magistrate of Patna now preserved in the library of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.

On the 13th March, 1812, J. Richardson, Agent to the Governor-General in Bundelkhand communicated to the acting Magistrate of Mirzapore the news of the approach of a large body of predatory horse (the Pindaris) towards Mirzapore. This was soon communicated to W. A. Brooke, Agent, Governor-General, Benares, Major-General Wood, Commissioner of Chunar, William Cowell, Magistrate of Shahabad, Henry Douglas, Magistrate of Patna, Major-General Watson, Commanding Dinapore, Major Roughsedge, Commanding the Ramgarh Battalion, and W. Fleming, Magistrate, Ramgarh for taking the necessary defensive measures. It was reported that the Pindaris had advanced towards Sassaram and Daudnagar, that the villages in the vicinity of Daudnagar and along the banks of the Sone had been in flames, and that they had been making for Patna. The force at Dinapore was inadequate for the protection of the city of Patna, not to mention of the district. Major-General Watson kept ready the whole of the cavalry volunteers under Captain O'Brien and he hoped that with these, the disposable force at Dinapore and the help of Roughsedge who held a central position on the bank of the Sone any attempt on the city or the districts in the vicinity would be beaten off. But it was necessary to enlist the zealous co-operation of the civil authorities

* Read at the 16th Session of the Indian Historical Records Commission, 1939.

78 *Defence of Patna against the Pindari Incursion of 1812*

and to adopt every measure to ensure defence and to avoid panic in the public mind. He also suggested the expediency of clearing and deepening the ditch and repairing the walls of the city. The letters on the subject are annexed hereto.

KALIPADA MITRA

LETTERS

(From the Records of Judge and Magistrate, Patna, now preserved in the office of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Patna)

To

HENRY DOUGLAS, ESQUIRE, Magistrate of the City of Patna.

SIR,

I beg leave to acquaint you that a body of Pendaries, estimated at ten or twelve thousand, have entered the District of Mirzapore and have plundered and destroyed many of the villages.

As it is not ascertained what Direction they may take I have deemed it my Duty to give you this information.

Benares

14th March, 1812.

I have etc.

(Sd.) W. A. BROOKE, A.G.G.

(A copy of a letter written to Lieut. Col. Toone received by Wm. Cowell, Magistrate, Zila Shahabad, 17th March, 1812 and sent to H. Douglas, Magistrate of the City of Patna).

To

LIEUT. COL. TOONE, Commanding at Buxar.

SIR,

In the temporary absence of Major-General Wood I deem it desirable to inform you that a body of Predatory Horse said to amount to between 10 or 11000 are burning and plundering within the neighbourhood of Mirzapore and may probably extend their depredations along the banks of the Sone.

The only disposable force at Benares consisting of 3 companies and Two Guns have received orders to cross the river at Ramnagur this day in hopes of checking their progress.

Benares,

14th March, 1812.

I have etc.

(Sd.) H. O. DONNELLY, LT. COL.
Commanding at Sicrole.

A true copy

(Sd.) W. TOONE, LT. COL.

A true copy

WM. COWELL, Magistrate, (Zila Shahabad).

To

W. COWELL, ESQUIRE, Magistrate of Zillah Shahabad.

SIR,

I beg to enclose copy of a letter from the Governor-General's Agent in Bundelcund, in addition to which, I have the honour to inform you that these Pindarees having plundered different parts of this district, and after having crossed the Soone River are now said to have proceeded towards Sasaram and Daoodnagur. I trust this information will be of use in enabling you to take immediate steps for the preservation of your district.

Defence of Patna against the Pindari Incursion of 1812 79

I have the pleasure to enclose you copies of letters addressed to me by Mr. Brooke, the Governor-General's Agent at Benares which will show you the measures which have been adopted in this district.

Zillah Mirzapore,
The 11th March, 1812

I am etc.
(Sd.) WM. LOCK,
a. Mag.

To

THE ACTING MAGISTRATE OF ZILLAH, MIRZAPORE.

SIR,

I have the honour to enclose for your information the copy of a Persian Paper containing intelligence transmitted to me by the Rajah of Rewah—that you may adopt such measures as you may deem expedient to guard against the probable depredations of the Horsemen in question should they attempt to molest the British dominions under your charge.

I have further to add that intelligence of a body of 6,000 Pindarrahs, having passed rapidly through the Territories of Doorjun Sing of Mahere, above the Ghauts, and situated to the westward of the Rewah Dominions was conveyed by Doorjun Sing to Captain Whitehead the officer Commanding on the day before the date of the present intelligence.

I have no further intelligence of these Horsemen, they may be part of the considerable Pindarrahs force of Kurrceem, and another Pindarrahs chief, whose name I do not recollect. This Pindarrahs force, lately suffered a severe defeat and were dispersed by one of Scindia's Commanders, the party of (*Sic*) which this intelligence alludes may either be in search of plunder, or possibly called to the aid of Dulgunjun Sing.

Banda,
The 13th March, 1812.

I have the honour to be etc.
(Sd.) J. RICHARDSON, A.G.G.

A true copy

To

HENRY DOUGLAS, ESQ., Magistrate, Patna.

SIR,

The accompanying papers have just been received and I am directed by Major General Watson to request that you will return them after perusal.

As far as the progress of the predatory Horse can be traced the Major General thinks it beyond a doubt that they are, at the moment, on the side of the Soane, and as our present force is altogether inadequate for the protection of the District, it becomes an object of the first importance to protect the city of Patna with the few disposable troops we have at command. One company and two six pounders are in readiness to attend your requisition.

Wm. Cowell's request it will be impossible under present circumstances to comply with unless you are already of opinion that the city of Patna is in no danger.

Dinapore,
18th March, 1812.

I have etc.
(Sd.) A. BROWN
illegible.

To

HENRY DOUGLAS, ESQ., Judge and Magistrate, Patna.

SIR,

I am directed by Major General Commanding Dinapore to acquaint you that a Hircarrah came in here about an hour and a half ago and reported that the villages on the side of Doudnagar and all along the banks of the Soane were in flames and that a body of Horse were marching in this direction with great rapidity.

Altho' there are only about 300 men in Cantonments the Major General is under no apprehension of their effecting any serious injury here, but the inadequate force for the complete protection of the city of Patna must be apparent to every one.

From the general character of the predatory horse the Major General does not think it probable that they will be daring enough to attempt plundering the city and he does not believe the account of the Hircarrah to be altogether correct and most probably much exaggerated.

Dinapore,
19th 12 noon.

I have etc.
(Sd.) A. BROWN

To

H. DOUGLAS, Esq, Magistrate, Patna.

SIR,

I beg leave to enclose, for your information, copy of an Urzi from Tuab Ali to the Magistrate of Gyah just received. The intelligence it contains agreeing with every other account from the same quarter cannot be doubted.

As one successful irruption to the British Territory will naturally encourage more numerous and formidable Invaders, and as the present unprotected state of the country from want of troops in every quarter, exposes the whole of South Behar to the depredations of the Pindarries, I have deemed it necessary, on the present emergency to detain at this station the whole of the Cavalry Volunteers under Captain O'Brien, amounting to about 300 men. Every possible exertion will be made to mount them as expeditious as possible; and I am in hopes, that should the predatory horse continue their progress Northward, the central position of Captn. Roughsedge on the bank of the Soane, with the cavalry volunteers, and disposeable force here, will preclude any attempt on the city of Patna or the Districts in the vicinity.

I rely much on the cordial co-operation and zeal of the civil authorities, on whom during the present scarcity of troops, so much depends; and as the country to the north of the Ganges is in the greatest security, I would beg leave to suggest, in the event of the Pindarries continuing to advance in this direction, that all the detached Guards on the North of the River, furnished from the Provincial Battalion, be withdrawn and replaced by Burkondoses, and that all the public money be conveyed to Patna Treasury, which ought to be secured as far as possible. As soon as the cavalry can be put into a state of serviceable efficiency, we shall be able with the aid of the Infantry Detachment and Guns, to expel the invaders from Bihar, should they have the temerity to advance into the centre of the Province, but in the meantime every measure of defence which prudence can suggest consistent with the means at our disposal, ought to be immediately adopted; at the same time using every suitable precaution that circumstances may require for avoiding whatever may tend unnecessarily to excite alarm in the minds of the people or to magnify the real danger beyond its proper extent:

Dinapore,
30th March, 1812.

I have etc.
(Sd) SAM. WATSON, Major General.

(Urzi in Persian).

To

H. DOUGLAS, Esq., Magistrate, Patna.

SIR,

I enclose the accompanying copy of a letter from the Rajah of Tickarry's Agent at Chittra for your information. The number of the horse is much exaggerated but it is evident they are increasing daily, and that they will do invaluable mischief in the present state of the country.

Dinapore,
5th April, 1812.

SAM. D. WATSON, Major General.

To

HENRY DOUGLAS, ESQ., Magistrate, Patna.

SIR,

I beg leave to enclose the accompanying copy of letter to the Magistrate of Gyah from the Darogah of Moujeah, a Town about 7 kos from Rotas, which arrived last night.

Altho' I entertain not the smallest apprehension of any attack upon the city, yet, as a measure of precaution, permit me to suggest the expediency of clearing and deepening the Ditch, and repairing the walls as far as practicable. This may be done at a very trifling expense with the assistance of the Prisoners; and, in the Event of any sudden irruption of predatory horse, or armed Banditti of any kind, will afford ample security to the persons and property of the native Inhabitants.

The immense extent of the city and suburbs preclude the possibility of defending the whole successfully against a large body of Horse with the handful of men which can be spared for its Defence, a circumstance which renders every measure of precaution imperiously necessary.

Dinapore,
7th April, 1812.

I have etc.
(Sd.) SAM. WATSON, Major General.

Copy of a letter written to Mr. T. Syson, the late acting Magistrate of Behar.

To

MR. T. SYSON.

Judicial Dept.

SIR,

I am directed by the Right Hon'ble the Governor-General in Council to acknowledge the Receipt of a letter from you dated the 22nd Inst.

The Governor-General in Council does not deem it necessary to suspend his orders regarding the publication, to which your letter refers, until further enquiries can be made for the purpose of ascertaining the precise number of Pindaries, who are computed in it to have invaded the British Territories—It is sufficient to remark on that point that whether the estimated number was 10,000, 12,000, or 15,000 it was in either case, vastly exaggerated.

The Governor-General in Council doubts not that you were actuated by the properest motives in issuing the publication in question. His Lordship in Council is at the same time of opinion that the terms of it instead of being calculated to infuse among the people a confidence in their own strength and Exertions, and to excite a spirit of Resistance to the Plunderers agreeable to your laudable intention in issuing it, had on the contrary a tendency to create only discouragement and alarm.

It is intimated in your Letter, that none of the Zemindars would have ventured to have entertained armed men for the purpose of repelling the Pindares without the authority of the Magistrate. But supposing such authority to have been requisite and the circumstances of the moment to have rendered it advisable to grant it, the Governor-General in Council would have supposed that you could have experienced little difficulty in furnishing them with the required authority, in a form and in terms free from the objections to which the publication in question (as already noticed) is subject.

Re. Propriety of great caution and Reserve in addressing publications of a general nature to the inhabitants of the Province.

(Sd.) G. DODWESWELL

Council Chamber,
25th April, 1812.

Guṇapataṭākā

(An unknown Sanskrit work and its date—before A.D. 1200)

No work of the name *Guṇapataṭākā* has been recorded by Aufrecht in his *Catalogus Catalogorum*. In the list of Plays recorded by Prof. D. R. Mankad in his *Types of Sanskrit Drama*¹ he records a work called “*Guṇamālā*” mentioned by Abhinavagupta in his commentary on the *Nāṭyaśāstra* but its connection with *गुणपताका* remains doubtful at present. I propose, therefore, to record in this paper some references to a work called *गुणपताका* and indicate as far as possible the chronology of these references which may prove the existence of this work for a period of at least 500 years, if not more.

Nārāyaṇa Dikṣita² in his commentary on the *Vāsavadattā* of Subandhu, which is later than about 1250 A.D. mentions and quotes from the *गुणपताका* as follows:—

1 Published by Urmi Prakashan Mandir, Karachi, 1936, Appendix, p. 172—“*गुणमाला* Abh. 177”. On p. 177 of the G.O.S. Edition of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, vol. I (1926) we find the following quotation from the *गुणमाला* in the अभिनव-भारती commentary:—

“*गुणमालायां* ‘जामि हरार्धातुं गियपुणं चिसमी’खाई, तल सा नृत्यती डोम्बिका etc.” I cannot say if *गुणमाला* mentioned by Abhinavagupta is identical with *गुणपताका* or otherwise. Prof. Kane also makes no remark against *गुणमाला* in his *Gleanings from Abhinavabhārati* [K. B. Pathak Comm. Vol. (B.O.R. Institute, Poona, 1934), p. 389]: In the indices to the *Sanskrit Drama* by Keith no work of the name *गुणमाला* or *गुणपताका* is recorded. In the same manner no reference to these works is found in the Index of Titles given by Prof. M. Dillon, on pp. 145-6 of his edition of the *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa*, Oxford, 1937. Krishnamachariar (*Classical Sans. Literature*, 1937, p. 548) mentions डोम्बिका as an उपनाटक of which *गुणमाला* and *चूडामणि* are examples. See also p. 820 where he calls *गुणमाला* and *चूडामणि* as “lyrical plays”, Keith and Winternitz record no work of the name *गुणमाला* or *गुणपताका*.

2 Vide my paper on *Nārāyaṇa Dikṣita and other commentators of the Vāsavadattā* (*Annals of B.O.R. Institute*, vol. XXI, pp. 128-144).

Folio 21 of Ms. No. 567 of 1891-95 (B.O.R. Institute).

—“बाला स्यात्षोडशाब्दा तदुपरि तरुणी विशतं या तदूर्ध्वं

प्रौढा स्यात्पंचपंचाशदवधिपरतो वृद्धतामेति नारी ।

उक्तं च गुणपताकायाम्—

वा(बा)ला ताम्बूल वा(भा)ला फलरसमुरसाहारसम्मानहार्या

मुक्तालंकारहारप्रमुखवितरणै रज्यते यौवनस्था ।

सद्भावारगठगाढोद्धतरतसुखिता मध्यमा रागलुब्धा

वृद्ध(द्वा)लापैः प्रहृष्टा भवति गत(भ?)या गौरवेणातिदूरम् ॥

एवंभूतानां मालतीनां युवतीनां माला अनधिगतपरिमालापि अनास्वादितरतोपमद्विक-
सहेहरागादिसौरभापि दशं द्वारं विकारत्वाद्धरति ।”

As a result of my inquiry with some of my friends I have succeeded
in locating some more references to गुणपताका. They are as follows :

Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa in his work called the प्राकृतचन्द्रिका mentions गुणपताका
and quotes a Prākṛit verse” from it as follows :—

Ms.¹ No. 243 of 1895-98 (B.O.R. Institute, Poona) Folio 4b—

“गुणपताकायामपि

संसारो कामात्रो कामो णिव्वहइ युवद्वरअणात्रो

जं तम्मि तेण सारं भणिअं बहुजागुराण फुडं ॥”⁴

Unlike the Sanskrit quotation from गुणपताका recorded above
from Nārāyaṇa Dikṣita’s commentary on the *Vāsavadattā* we have
in the above extract a Prākṛit verse from गुणपताका .

It remains to be seen if the work गुणपताका was a “lyrical
play” of the type of गुणमाला referred to by Abhinavagupta
(A.D. 990-1020).⁵ If the quotation from the गुणपताका from
Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa’s *Prākṛita-candrikā* is genuine, it may enable us to infer

3 Supplied by Prof. R. D. Laddu of the S. P. College, Poona.

4 There is another MS. of the *Prākṛita-Candrikā* at the B.O.R. Institute
(No. 255 of 1884-86). This MS. is a late copy made at Bombay by Gaṇeśa
Parashuram Godbole in Śaka 1807 (=A.D. 1885.) The third MS. of the work is
found in the India Office Library (MS. 945, p. 267 of *I.O. Cata.*, II, 1889). Dr.
Eggeling describes this MS. as “fairly written in Devanāgarī, about A.D. 1550.”
If this description is correct the MS. appears to be a contemporary copy and hence
extremely valuable for a critical edition of this text.

5 P. V. Kane: *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, 1923, Index of authors, p. clx.

that Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa who flourished towards the end of the 16th century⁶ had before him a Ms. of the गुणपताका or that he had taken this quotation from some other Sanskrit or Prākṛit work as an illustration borrowed secondhand. Even if we suppose that the quotation does not form part of the *Prākṛta-candrikā*, it must retain its value as we know of no other quotation from गुणपताका in Prākṛit recorded in a Ms. References to the गुणपताका by Nārāyaṇa Dikṣita and by Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa being somewhat of a later date do not give us any idea about the antiquity of this work. It is, therefore, necessary to see if there is any evidence to suggest or warrant an inference that this work, whatever be its exact nature or contents, is earlier than A.D. 1200. Such evidence is fortunately forthcoming⁷ from a commentator on the *Mālatīmādhava* of Bhavabhūti, who is no other than Harihara who composed his commentary during the reign of

6 Aufrecht: CC., I, 117. Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa flourished during the reign of Emperor Akbar.

7 While commenting on “नववधूविश्रम्भणोपायज्ञातारं” (*Mālatīmādhava*, Act VII, p. 192 of Bhandarkar's edition) Harihara says (p. 82):—

“नववधूविश्रम्भणोपायस्तु । बाला ताम्बूलमाला फलरससुरसाहारसंमानहार्येत्यादि लौकिकः कन्यावर्जनोपायः”

Jagaddhara (p. 292 of Bhandarkar's edn.) who has at times borrowed ~~verb~~ verbatim says:—

“नववधूविश्रम्भणोपायस्ताम्बूलादिदानम् । यदाह । बाला ताम्बूलमालाफलरससुरसाहारसंमानहार्येत्यादिकः सुप्रसिद्ध एव ।”

It will be seen from Harihara's quotation given above that he is quoting the stanza “बाला ताम्बूलमाला etc.” which Nārāyaṇa Dikṣita quotes as from a work called गुणपताका. How the name गुणपताका came to be applied to the work under reference may perhaps be explained by the following reference to गुणपताका made by Harihara in commenting on the *Mālatīmādhava* verse “असारे संसारे (Act V of Bhand. edn. p. 232). Harihara says:—

“त्वया च मालत्यामसमञ्जसं प्रक्रममाणेन संसार एवासारः कर्तुं प्रकान्तः । संसारे किं सारमिति गुणपताकया पृष्टो मूलदेवः सारं निहितपदेति”—(p. 65 of transcript of Harihara's commentary on *Mālatīmādhava*). I am indebted to Prof. N. A. Gore for the above references.

Arimalladeva, the founder of the Malla dynasty of Nepal. In fact Harihara records the date of composition of his commentary which corresponds to A.D. 1216.⁸ Harihara appears to have flourished between A.D. 1150 and 1225.

The suggestion made by me in the foregoing lines to the effect that *Guṇapatākā* was a definite work of that title gets further strengthened by the mention of the work by Pṛthvidhara, the commentator of the *Mṛcchakatika*,⁹ who quotes from it in his commentary on Act IV while explaining the term “गणिकादारिका:”—

[“गणिकादारिका: वेश्याविशेषा” इति गुणपताकायामुक्तम्]

The approximate chronology of the references to *Guṇapatākā* recorded so far is as follows:—

A.D.

1216

—Harihara in his commentary on the *Mālatīmādhava* quotes a verse which is quoted by Nārāyaṇa Dikṣita as from a work called *Guṇapatākā*. Harihara also refers to a female character of the name *Guṇapatākā* at one place in his commentary.

Between
1250 and
1550

—Nārāyaṇa Dikṣita mentions and quotes from a work called *Guṇapatākā* in his commentary on the *Vāsavadattā*.

Between
1300 and
1500

—Jagaddhara, copying Harihara, quotes the verse which is already quoted by Harihara as mentioned above.

8 Vide *Descriptive Cata. of Kāvya MSS.*, vol. VII (1934), pp. 242-243. The date of composition as recorded in MS. No. 5299 is Newari Samvat 336=A.D. 1216, which I take to be the date of composition. Even if this is the date of the copy the date of Harihara lies between A.D. 1150 and 1225 as he quotes from Mammaṭa's *Kāvya-prakāśa* (about A.D. 1100).

9 Vide p. 103 of *Mṛcchakatika*, ed. H. M. Sarma, N. S. Press, Bombay, 1910. *Vidūṣaka*—“गणिकादारिका: नर्त्यन्ते...” Pṛthvidhara appears to belong to the end of the 15th century A.D. I propose to deal with his date in a separate paper.

- c. 1500 —Prthvidhara in his commentary on the *Mṛcchakaṭīka* mentions and quotes from the *Guṇapatākā*.
- c. 1600 —Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa mentions and quotes from the *Guṇapatākā* (a Prākṛta verse in his *Prākṛta-candrikā*).

It will be seen from the above table that a work of the name *Guṇapatākā* known to Sanskrit writers from say A.D. 1200 to 1600 i.e. a period of 400 years has apparently been lost and consequently not even its name is recorded by Aufrecht in his *Catalogus Catalogorum* or by other compilers of Catalogues. I shall feel thankful if any close students of Sanskrit literature throw more light on this work viz. the *Guṇapatākā* by recording any references to it found by them during the course of their studies.

P. K. GODE

MISCELLANY

The Māluta Jātaka in Folk-lore

In Fausböll's collection of the *Pāli Jātakas*, volume I, p. 164, occurs the story entitled the *Māluta Jātaka* [No. 17], in which the futility of petty, baseless quarrels is illustrated by a short but pointed parable. Like the Big-endians and the Little-endians of Swift, the two monks named Kāla Thero and Juṇha Thero entered into a futile controversy, each questioning the other as to the time when the cold appeared. Now one day Juṇha said to Kāla, "Sir, at what time does what is called cold (*sīta*) appear?" "It appears in the dark half of the month." And one day Kāla said to Juṇha, "Sir, at what time does what is called cold appear." "It appears in the light half of the month." Not being able to solve the question between them, they went to the Buddha and with due salutation asked, saying, "Sir, at what time does what is called cold appear?"

After the master had heard what they had to say, he recounted a story from the past saying that even then they had engaged themselves into unfruitful squabbles of a similar nature. The story runs thus:

'Once on a time at the foot of a certain mountain there were living together in one and the same cave two friends, a lion and a tiger. The Bodhisattva too was living at the foot of the same hill as a hermit.

Now one day a dispute arose between the two friends about the cold. The tiger said it was cold in the dark half of the month, whilst the lion maintained that it was cold in the light half. As the two of them together could not settle the question, they put it to the Bodhisattva. He repeated this stanza:—

काले वा यदि वा जुगहे यदा वायति माळुतो ।

वातजानि हि सीतानि उभोत्थमपराजिता ति ॥

'In light or dark half, whensoe'er the wind

Doth blow, 'tis cold. For cold is caused by wind

And, therefore, I decide you both are right.'¹

The stanza being the kernel of the story has been preserved in several

1 Eng. Translation of the *Jātakas*, vol. I by Robert Chalmers, p. 51.

languages of north India. In Panjābī the present saying is a virtual translation of the Pāli verse, preserving the beautiful setting of the parable:

सुनो सिंह सरदार, सुनो अखे राव जी ।

पाला पोह न पाला माघ, पाला बावजी ॥

The lion is addressed as *Sardar*, and the tiger is referred to as *Raoji*. In place of the light and dark halves of the month as the alternative periods of *sīta* the versions in several dialects invariably substitute the names of the two months, *Pauṣa* and *Māgha*. The Panjābī form of *Pauṣa* is *Poh*, and for *sīta* the popular word *pālā* is used.

There is a variant version of the couplet in Panjābī:

पाला पोहन माह सुनो सिंह हरि राय जी ।

पाला ओदों जानिये, जदों बग्गे बाय जी ॥

'Listen please, O Lion, and Rao ji (Tiger), cold is peculiar neither to *Poh*, nor to *Māh*. Take that to be the time of cold when the wind blows.'

In the dialect of Meerut, near the Kuru country, the saying is separated from its setting in the old story, and has assumed the character of a general statement:

माह न जाडा, पूस न जाडा । ब्याल, चलै तब जाडा इ जाडा ॥

(ब्याल, is बयार or बात, wind)

In the dialect round about Bareilly, the country of the north Pañcāla, the saying is preserved in the following form:

माघइ जाड न पूसइ जाड । जबइ बयरिया तबइ जाड ॥

In the dialect round about Benares (*Kāśī* Janapada), the form is as follows:

माघै जाड न पूसै जाड । जबै बतास तबै जाड ॥

For wind, बात, the more emphatic word बतास is used in the above, the rest of the sentence is practically identical with the one in other dialects.

According to the Jātaka preamble the dispute between the two monks arose when they were living in a forest-dwelling in the Kosala country (*Kosala janapada ekasmiṃ araṇṇāvāse*). It is somewhat surprising that the tradition in the Panjābī language is nearer to the original story than the one current nearer home in the *janapadas* of Kāśī, Pañcāla or Kuru.

I also believe that the saying corresponding to the verse in the Jātaka story must have been preserved in other dialects also, and it would be well if other scholars also made a search for it and published it in the Journal.

A Linguistic Note on the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad

The *Muṇḍaka* is regarded as one of the principal Upaniṣads. As regards its language, it presents some peculiarities which are not to be found in other *Upaniṣads*. The language used in this Upaniṣad is much influenced by Prakritism and the Buddhist or the mixed Sanskrit as found in such Buddhist Sanskrit works as the *Mahāvastu*, etc. Let us give some examples:

There is the use of the word *atharvan* (I. 1. 2), but we have also *athārva* ending in *a*; e.g., *atharvāya* (I. 1. 1). Cf. *atharvī* 'female priest.'

In I. 1. 6 we come across *adreśya* for *adrśya*, here *ṛ* being changed to *re*, as from *gr̥ha* (<**gr̥bha*) through **grebe* we have *geha* which, strictly speaking, is not a Skt. but a Pkt. word, though it is found in the *Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā* (XXX, 9) and even in the grammar of Pāṇini (III. 1. 144).

In Skt. both Vedic and Classic, the ending in the imperative mood, second person, plural, is *-ta*, but in the *Muṇḍaka* in many cases we have *-tha*; e.g., *ācaratha* (I. 2. 1) for *ācarata*; *jānatha* (II. 2. 1) for *jānita*; *vimuñcata* (I. 2. 5) for *vimuñcata*; *dhyāyatha* (I. 2. 6) for *dhyāyata*.

Such forms are well-known in Buddhist Skt., e.g. *prativedayatha* (*Mahāvastu* III, p. 1) for *prativedayata*; *ānetha* (p. 8) for *ānayata*; *karotha* (p. 24) for *kuruta*. We have it also in Pāli and Pkt.; e.g. in Pāli *āharatha* (*Jātaka* I, 266⁹) for *āharata*, *anurakkhatha* (*Dhammapada*, 327) for *anurakṣata*; *gaṇhatha* (*Jātaka*, III, 126²³) for *gr̥hṇāta*; in Pkt. this *-tha* changes to *-ha* in *Māhārāṣṭrī* and *Ardhamāgadhī*, *-bu* in *Apabhraṃśa*, and *-dha* in *Māgadhī* and *Saurasenī*; in *Cūlikāpaśācī* it remains unchanged (see Pischel, §471); e.g. for Skt. *namata* *Māhārāṣṭrī* *namaha*, *Apabhraṃśa* *ṇamahu*, *Cūlikāpaśācī* *namatha*; for *kuruta* *Māgadhī* *kaledha*; for *apanayata* *Saurasenī* *avanedha*.

This *-tha* *-ta* is from Indicative, present, second person plural *-tha*.

In I. 1.7 there is *gr̥hṇate* (present, third person, singular) for *gr̥hṇāti*. Cf. here *gr̥hṇa-* with *gaṇha-* (as in *gaṇha-ti*, Skt. *gr̥hṇā-ti*) of Pāli and *giṇha-* (as in *giṇha-ha*, Skt., *gr̥hṇī-ta*) of Pkt. This can, however be traced back even to the Vedic language. See Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*, 3rd ed., 1896, 731.

For *vidhya* (imperative, second person, singular) from $\sqrt{\text{vyadh}}$ 'to pierce' there is *viddhi* (II. 2-2. 3). Here $\sqrt{\text{vyadh}}$ and $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ 'to know' are confounded.

There is a word *sandhayīta* 'one should fix' (II. 2.3) for *sandadhīta* from *saṃ + √dhā*. This form is on the analogy of *kāmayīta* in the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* for *kāmayeta*, and *abbivādayīta* (*Āpastamba-dharmasūtra*, 1. 5.12, 16; 14. 16. 22) for *abbivādayeta*, *prasārayīta* (*Op. cit.*, 1.6.3; 1.31.8) for *prasārayeta*, etc. in the *Sūtras* and the *Mahābhārata*, see Whitney, 1043, c, and the Introduction (p. 87) to my *Pāliprakāśa*.

For classical *anubhūya* there is *anubbhūtvā* (I. 2.10). But such gerunds in *-tvā* from compounded roots are met with in considerable number from the *Ātharvaveda* downwards. See Whitney, 990, a. As regards this suffix of gerund there is no difference between compounded and non-compounded roots in Pālī and Pkt.

The most peculiar form in this Upaniṣad (1.2.5) is *ādadāyan* from *ā + √dā*. No doubt, it is a present participle. The commentator construes it with *āhutayaḥ* writing: *ādadāyann ādadānā āhutayaḥ*. But I think it is to be taken with *yaḥ*. In this case *āhutayaḥ* is to be explained somehow or other in the sense of accusative plural. Let the passage be quoted here:

cteṣu yaś carata bhrājamāneṣu
yathākālāṃ cāhutayo hy ādadāyan/
taṃ nayanty etāḥ sūryasya rāsmayo
yatra devānāṃ patir ekavāsaḥ//

In this connection the word *bahvīḥ* (II. 1.5) evidently for *bahvyaḥ* (*bahvīḥ prajāḥ puruṣāt saṃprasūtāḥ*) deserves to be noted.

The use of *pravadeta* (I. 1.2) for *prāvadat* or *avadat* as explains the commentator is also peculiar.

The employment of *saṃ + vi + √bhā* as in *saṃvibhāti* (III. 1.10) in the sense of 'to imagine' (commentator: *saṅkalpayati*) is found nowhere excepting the present case. In meaning, as shown above, *saṃvibhāti* is *saṃvibhā (vaya)ti*. And so it appears that the former is used for the latter on the metrical grounds.

In III, 2.2 we have *kāmabhiḥ* for *kāmebbhiḥ* in Vedic and *kāmaiḥ* in classical Skt. Clearly it is on the analogy of *nāmabhi*, etc. Such uses are often found in Buddhist Skt.

In II. 1.5 for *yoṣit* 'female' used in Vedic and Classical texts we have *yoṣitā* as *saritā* for *sarit* in Buddhist Skt. (*Mahāvastu*, III, 388.10), and *sariā* in Pkt. (Hemacandra, I. 15).

It will be found in the examples given below that it is only in order to avoid hiatus that the particle *hi* is inserted in them. And this fact shows a much later stage of the language that is used in the Upaniṣad. Here are the examples referred to above :

1. yadā lelāyate hy arcīḥ, I. 2. 2.
2. āhutayo hy ādadāyan, I. 2.5.
3. plavā hy etc, I. 2. 7. Here *hi* has some special meaning.
4. ye hy upavasanty arāṇye, I. 2. 11.
5. puruṣo hy avyayātmā, I. 2.11.
6. divyo hy amūrttaḥ puruṣaḥ
sabāhyābhyantaro hy ajaḥ/
aprāṇo hy amanāḥ śubhro
hy akṣarāt parataḥ paraḥ//
7. padbhyāṃ pṛthivī hy eṣa sarvabhūtāntarātmā, II. 1.4.
8. tiṣṭhate hy antarātmā, II. 1.9.
9. śaro hy ātmā, II. 2.4.
10. brahmapure hy ātmā, II. 2.7.
11. prāṇo hy eṣa yaḥ, III. 1.4.
12. tapasā hy eṣa ātmā, III. 1.5.
13. rṣayo hy ātmakāmāḥ, III. 1.6.
14. ātmajñāṇaḥ hy arcayet, III. 1.10.
15. ye hy akāmāḥ, III. 2.1.

VIIDHUSHEKHARA BHATTACHARYA

The Muslim Conquest of Bengal

(under *Ikhtiyaruddin Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār*).

In spite of the progress of historical research in recent years, the episode of the conquest of Bengal has remained obscure. After the late R. D. Banerjee had written the history of Bengal and called into question the authenticity of the account of *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, the subject became more clouded by a heated controversy. A sketch of the account, may, therefore, be again presented in these pages.

It is well-known that the earliest narrative of this event is preserved in *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī* by Abu Omar Minhājuddīn Uṣmān who visited Lakhnauti in 1241 A.D. and travelled as far as Devkot in modern Dinajpur district. He became acquainted with persons who participated in the raid on Bihar¹ and in the expedition against Tibet but as his account contains certain absurdities, it has been discredited as being utterly untrustworthy.

The curious portions of *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*'s account consist of the date of Lakṣmaṇasena's birth and of Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār's personal features. About these two statements, Uṣmān says that "reliable persons have stated that when the father of Rai Lakhmaniya died, he was in his mother's womb. The crown was placed on the belly of the mother and all engaged themselves heart and soul in their ministrations. When the birth of Lakhmaniya drew near and the signs of his mother's delivery became visible, she assembled the astrologers and the brahmins, in order that they might observe the auspicious hour.² They said unanimously that if the child was born at this moment, it would be extremely inauspicious and would not attain sovereignty, and if it was born two hours after this (moment), it would reign for eighty-two years. When she heard this forecast of the astrologers, she ordered (them) to bind her two legs and keep her suspended with the head down-

¹ *Ṭabaqāt*, B.I. 147, 153.

Abu Omar Minhājuddīn Uṣmān, son of Sirājuddīn-Al-Jurjānī, never states to have heard the account of the capture of Nadiya from Samsamuddīn. He heard the account of the raid of Bihar from the latter and the account of Tibet expedition from Mutamuddulāh. This paper was read in Bengali in the Baṅgiya Sāhitya Sammilan, Comilla Session.

² "Ṭali' waqt" has been translated by Raverty, p. 555 as horoscope but it is better to translate it as "auspicious hour." The astrologers were asked to tell the time by calculating the exact position of the stars etc.

wards. The astrologers were kept seated in order that they might watch for the (auspicious) hour. When it came, they said with one accord that the hour of birth had arrived. She ordered to take her down and immediately Lakhmaniya was born (but) as soon as she was brought down on the ground she died from the severe pain of this forced restraint of delivery. Rai Lakhmaniya was then placed on the throne.

Regarding the peculiarity in the physical features of Bakhtiyār, Uṣmān says that when the news of the conquest of Bihar by Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār reached the people, "a number of astrologers, brahmins and paṇḍits³ of the kingdom came to him" (Lakṣmaṇasena) and prayed saying "Your Majesty, it has been narrated in our books by the ancient brāhmaṇas that the kingdom will fall into the hands of the Turks and that the appointed time has drawn near." The Turks have subjugated Bihar and they will certainly appear next year in this kingdom; it is (therefore) advisable that the Rai should agree to the evacuation of all people from this country.....The Rai replied, "Is there no sign recorded in your books for the identification of the man who is to subjugate our country." The brahmins rejoined "the sign of him is this that when he stands upright on his two feet and lets down his hands, they will reach beyond the knee-joint touching the calves with fingers."⁴ The Rai said, "it is desirable to send trustworthy persons in order that they might properly investigate the marks. According to Rai's directions they sent reliable persons who made the inquiry and found those marks on Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār.

"When they became assured of these signs, the majority of the brahmins and *sābhās*⁵ of the place went to Sankanat, Bang and Kamrup but to quit the country was not agreeable to the Rai and in the following year this Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār made an army ready, set (it) in motion from Bihar and all on a sudden appeared before the gate of the city of Nadiya in such a way that not more than eighteen horsemen could come up with him and rest of the troops followed (*mut'aqib*). When Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār entered the city, he did not injure anybody (and) moved so slowly

3 Hukāmā does not mean councillors (here) as Raverty has translated; it refers to the Paṇḍits versed in the śāstras. (Eng. trans. vol. I, 556).

4 The translation of the word *Saq* into calf is more desirable. [Raverty].

5 The translation of *Sahas* into inhabitants is equally objectionable. [Raverty]. (Eng. trans. vol. I, p. 557).

and sedately that nobody suspected that he was Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār and the majority of the people thought that they were traders and had brought horses for sale. In this way they reached the gate of the palace of Rai Lakhmaniya, when they drew out swords and commenced a slaughter of the unbelievers. At this time the Rai sat at his meal and gold and silver vessels filled with viands were placed before him according to the accustomed practice. A wail and lamentation arose from the gate of the palace and the interior of the city. When he had ascertained what it was, Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār pushed his way into the seraglio and had put (many) people to the sword. The Rai fled barefoot by the back-door of the palace and the whole of his treasures, wives, servants, officers and ladies fell into his hands, (they) captured a large number of elephants and such a large amount of booty was seized as the Muslims failed to describe; when the entire army arrived, the whole city came under his possession; he fixed his quarters here and Rai Lakhmaniya fled in the direction of Sankanat and Bang.”⁶

This is a full and exact translation of the account given by Abu Omar Minhājuddīn Uṣmān from which it would be clear that Nadiya was not conquered by eighteen horsemen. In the guise of traders, Bakhtiyār advanced as far as the gateway of the royal palace at the opportune midday hour, and then flung themselves upon the guards. They were overpowered and Bakhtiyār forced his way into the palace. Meanwhile, the army, which had been following him, came up and brought the city under their control by dispersing the royal force. Thus by a combination of stratagem, military skill and adroitness, Bakhtiyār conquered Nadiya and unfurled the banner of Islam.

This account is at substantial variance with the narration of R. D. Banerji which has gained currency, after the publication of the *History of Bengal*. He mistranslated Raverty’s translation and then used various arguments to refute it. In his opinion the fact that Nadiya was the capital of

6 *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri*, B.I., p. 150.

7 At this hour when the people retire for bath or meals, the guards were probably lax in their vigilance. Sir Jadunath has pointed out in another connection how the “Indians are overcome by lassitude after one o’clock in the afternoon.” The third battle of Panipat and Tipu’s fate were decided about this hour (Jadunath Sarkar, *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. II, pp. 336-337).

8 R. D. Banerji, *History of Bengal*, vol. I. 356-357, 9.

Lakṣmaṇasena is not supported by any reliable authority; secondly Jharkund route was impassable for a handful of men; thirdly, Nadiya was conquered by Mughisuddin Yuzbek in 653 A.H. It may be pointed out that these arguments are not at all strong. The nature of the description of Lakṣmaṇasena's capital, contained in Dhoyi's *Pavanadūtam* makes its identification with Navadvīp very likely." That Navadvīp was once a populous and prosperous city is attested by *Śrī Caitanya Bhāgavata* and *Ain-i-Akbari*.¹⁰ It has been shown already that Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār came with an army and not eighteen horsemen. Thirdly, taking the conquest of Nadiya in 653 A.H. for granted, though it is not warranted by the inscription on the coin, it does not preclude the fact of an earlier conquest of Bengal by Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār. The inscription on the coin "Min Kharāj arz badan wa Nadiya" means the land-tax of Badan and Nadiya and should be better interpreted as an evidence of the assumption of the regular administration of this tract by the Muslims from the vassal Hindu chieftains. There is, therefore, hardly any justification for setting aside the account of the capture of Nadiya given by Uṣman, however fantastic the story of Lakṣmaṇasena's birth might be.

A Persian manuscript has, however, recently been published which presents a different account of Lakṣmaṇasena's character and conduct. According to this account Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār came in the guise of a trader with rarities and when king Lakṣmaṇasena came accompanied by his retinue to look at these fine things, he was assailed, according to a pre-concerted plan, by Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār's men from all sides. There was a sharp clash of arms between the two parties; the Rājā's force was however defeated and he himself was taken prisoner. As the extract is very short, an English translation of this piece may be given here.¹²

I heard that (Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār) travelled like a trader from one end of the world to another.

9 Chintaharan Chakraborty, *Pavanadūtam*, 24-27.

10 (1) Brindaban Das Thakur, *Caitanya Bhāgavata*, (Baghbazar edition), p. 9 says that one lac of men bathed in its ghāt and none can describe its wealth.

(2) Abul Fazl says during the time of Lakṣmaṇasena, Nadiya was the capital of Bengal, when it abounded with wisdom but now it is thinly inhabited, although it is still conspicuous for learning."

11 *Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum*, II, p. 146.

12 *Futuh-us-salāṭin*, (ed. by Dr. M. Hussain), pp. 95-96.

Muhammad came to this country and the news was carried to Lakhmaniya that a trader had come from Sistan and brought many valuable articles.

Many Tartar horses, much China silk and exquisite things from all countries.

Immediately Lakhmaniya who was the ruler of the whole of this country rode from his palace in order that he might purchase¹³ some articles of each country.

He did not know that this treacherous world had kept another thought concealed in its head.

In short, the Rai came out of the palace and started towards the company of merchants.

I heard that when he reached them, Muhammad laid out before him the exquisite things.

Previously one of them had drawn up the men and accordingly he made a sign at his companions to rush in from all directions so that they could make the Hindus a centre of converging attack.

When the Turks fell upon the Hindus, the latter were scattered.

The large body of men who encompassed the Rai, became engaged (in a fight) with the fierce Turks.

They fought with the enemy for some time and the battle lingered on.

At length the valiants of the Khaljis made a charge like the whirlwind.

When they slew the few Hindu horsemen, the Rai was led captive into the presence of Bakhtiyār.

Muhammad became bādshāh over this kingdom the capital of his kingdom became separate from that of Delhi.

This account differs strikingly from that of *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī* in respect of the conduct of Rājā Lakṣmaṇasena when he was assailed by Muhammad bin Bakhtiyār's men. The brave stand made by the Rājā is also of a piece with his war-like character but Isami, the author of *Futub-us-salāṭin* wrote his book in 1350 A.D. about a century after the composition of *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*. Hence his account may not be given precedence over *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, so long as it is not corroborated by any other authority.

N. B. Roy

13 The word 'Kharu' in the Persian text should be 'khard'. *F.S.* p. 95.

Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya's economic Policy*

It is a well-known fact that the Vijayanagara empire was at the height of its glory during the time of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya. His exploits and achievements on the battle-field and on the arena of public administration have been carefully studied and authoritative works on the subject have been produced by professors like Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar. The recent work of Dr. Saletore on the social and political life of the Vijayanagara empire is a mine of information on the subject. Though economic life is not included in the title of the book, much that comes under that category is also detailed there in the several chapters. In this short paper an attempt is made to outline the economic policy of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya as gathered from two main sources (i) *Rāyavācakaṃ*, an almost contemporary evidence of his economic policy and the state of finances in his time, and (ii) *Āmuktamālyada*, a work containing autobiographical glimpses into his economic policy.

Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya was a Hindu emperor of the Middle Ages. Hindu polity and economics did not change considerably from ancient to mediaeval times. The long rule of Moslems all over India introduced many changes in the social, political and economic conditions of the people. As a Hindu ruler, Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya received training in *Rāja-nīti*. By the time he ascended the throne he became acquainted with the various schools of political and economic teaching of *Sañjaya-nīti*, *Vidura-nīti*, *Cāṇakya-nīti* and *Śukra-nīti*. Apart from this academic training, he was also influenced by the policy of Muhammadan rulers who had reigned before him. The abolition of taxes when they became very heavy was a part of the benevolent taxation-policy of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya. Several inscriptions refer to the abolition of many burdensome taxes that obstructed the growth of commerce. One of the inscriptions records the remission of Jodi and Arasuperu and other taxes by the king in favour of certain Śiva and Viṣṇu temples.¹ The revenue thus remitted amounted to 10,000 varāhas.

The chief source from which we get a clear enunciation of the economic policy of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya is the 4th canto of *Āmuktamālyada*, in which Yāmunaprabhu instructs his son in matters of policy and public

* Paper read at the 9th Session of the All-India Oriental Conference, Trivandrum.

1 *SII.*, 462.

finance. The policy outlined by Yāmunaprabhu was evidently what Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya himself followed in his reign, as was corroborated by the evidence of his personal experience, though it was greatly in accordance with the law-books of ancient India. Part of the credit goes to the famous minister Timmarasu who adorned his court and moulded his policy like the great Richelieu in the time of Louis XIV.

General features of financial administration

In Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya's public finance, greater importance was given to public expenditure. There were certain canons of expenditure. He laid down that the king should divide his income into four parts of which one part should be utilised for his personal expenditure and public charity; two quarters should be spent over the defence; and the remaining one-fourth should go to the treasury as surplus.² Evidently, ancient kings always planned surplus budgets; because they had to make provision for any unexpected expenditure for instance when a war would be waged. Again when there was great distress or a nation-wide scarcity on account of famine or any other havoc, something was spent out of the hoarded treasury to alleviate the distress of the people. The narrative of Paes says: "the king's treasuries maintained by the king were not opened except when the kings have great need and thus the kingdom had great supplies to meet its needs. This king made his treasury different from those of the previous kings, and he put in it every year 10 millions of pardaos without taking from them one pardao more than for the expenses of his house." (The pardao is a gold coin only struck in Vijayanagara, and it costs 360 rees).³ The rest was kept for him over and above these expenses and for the expenses in the houses of his wives. Again, the construction of big temples and the lavish sums bestowed on the gods for their festivities indicate how liberally Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya spent for purposes of charity. In those days, as in ancient India, charity was limited to the Brahmmins and donations were mainly for the temples. There are many inscriptions of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya which speak of the donations he made to the temples both in cash and by way of remission of taxes on temple-owned lands. Whenever he visited a shrine he would make a liberal donation.

² *Amuktamālyada*, Canto IV, verse 238.

³ Sewell, *A Forgotten Empire*, p. 282.

He realised that the amount of revenue depended on the extent of domain and that irrigation should be the prime concern of his government. He deprecated a policy of exploitation of the ryot by the ruler. "When a cultivator was not able to continue cultivation on account of heavy losses, the officer who, instead of recalling, would sell away the cattle and grains left by him in distress and would gloat that their houses would serve well as fuel, would be no better than the fox awaiting the corpse in the graveyard. A king with such officers would have no contentment even if he would become the lord of the seven lands."⁴ This clearly indicates how he favoured a policy of state-assistance to cultivators in times of distress. An inscription in Bellary speaks of the construction of an anicut at Vallābhapuram.⁵ Another speaks of a stone anicut built across the Tuṅgabhadra.⁶ Almost all the Vijayanagara kings took keen interest in providing irrigation facilities for their people. And specially Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya constructed many anicuts and caused the digging of tanks and wells.

While Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya tried to augment his income by the imposition of many taxes and dues, yet it must be said to his credit that he abolished many unjust taxes. In his taxation-policy he gave considerable weight to the canon of ability to pay and showed some consideration to the poor. He laid down that the poor should be shown consideration and concession in the matter of taxes of both in kind and coin (*Ari* and *Koru*).⁷

Revenue

The land-revenue and tributes formed the major part of his income. Apart from this, he wanted to increase the income of the state by such other means as the utilisation of natural resources like exploitation of mines, cultivation of waste lands and launching other kinds of state enterprise.

In the chapter of *Āmuktamālyada* already referred to, Yāmunaprabhu says that the ruler should encourage commerce and endeavour to see that elephants, precious stones and money were continuously attracted towards the ports of his country. He was also in favour of immigration, as indicated by his teaching that the king should protect and win over peoples of other

4 *Āmuktamālyada*, Canto IV, verse 237.

5 *Ins. Ced. Dist.*, No. 150.

6 *Ins. Ced. Dist.*, No. 159.

7 *Āmuktamālyada*, Canto IV, verse 236.

rulers when they wandered without food owing to scarcity of rains or to pestilence. In the same verse he explains that the king should distribute waste-lands among his people and bring them under cultivation and that mines should be explored and exploited and that their income should be added to the state. He was very particular about foreign trade. He always wished that his country should always have a favourable balance of trade and provided good facilities for the residence of foreign traders in his empire. He was particular that those traders who would export good horses from Sindhu should be generously treated and that all facilities should be given to encourage their trade and that there should be friendly relations with them. The merchants that would come from distant places, he says, should be provided with comfortable residence, given free access to the courts, and paid good prices for their articles, so that they would become friendly and would not go away to lands of enemies. In a beautiful verse he describes what the king ought to do to keep up the existence of the physical body and the body politic. "Dhātu (mineral products; pulse) should be secured. Excessive vigour (of the enemy: of the body) should be suppressed. Friendly feelings should be fostered; the improper conduct of the Naras (people; nerves) and varṇa (caste: colour) should be checked: parts requiring replenishment should be replenished (places needing population should be populated) and portions that should be made thin should be rendered so."⁸ Thus his policy of immigration and emigration was allied to that of population and colonisation.

He realised the importance of frontier policy, specially that of hill-borders. His idea was that the tracts along forest-borders should be thickly populated so that they might serve as buffer-states between the plains and the hills and free the country from the trouble of foreign invaders.

The main sources of income were land revenue, income from royal domain and tributes. But besides land tax, there was a number of imposts on land itself and all these are elaborately enumerated by Dr. Salatore in his voluminous work *The social and political conditions of the Vijayanagara empire*. In spite of the numerous taxes, what is of interest is the fact that the people did not seem to have felt overburdened because of the rich conditions in which they lived. Land taxes were paid in cash and

kind and the two kinds were called *ari* and *koru*, as mentioned in *Āmukta-mālyada*. As part of the land revenue policy must be mentioned how Kṛṣṇa Rāya caused the construction of many irrigation works. An inscription of this period in Salem records that villages had to pay three fanams each for irrigation facilities.⁹ Inscriptions in Bellary mention how anicuts were constructed at Vallabhapuram and across the Tuṅgabhadra by Kṛṣṇa Rāya.¹⁰

The other important taxes were excise and customs duties. Many kinds of duties covering all articles of common use fares, cloth-weaving, oils etc. are frequently mentioned in the inscription of the times, e.g., an inscription in Salem refers to a tax of three fanams on each loom and three on each plough but the weavers and cultivators were exempted from all other obligations and assessments like Eka-choru Varsoru, Alamañji etc.¹¹

Another inscription of the same place speaks of market tolls,¹² while that in Bellary of a tax on boats in the Tuṅgabhadra river.¹³

Besides these there were fees; state enterprise in mining etc. contributed to the sources of state income and forced labour was largely utilised in the construction of major public works and buildings.

Expenditure

Among the items of expenditure, defence formed the biggest. The amount spent on the army can be imagined from the following account given in *Rāya Vācakamu* about the daily expenditure on the several units of the army: 24 lakhs of *varābas* were spent a day on cavalry at the rate of 100 *ghats* for a horse; 12 lakhs on elephants at the rate of 1000 *ghats* a day for each elephant; 4 lakhs on infantry at the rate of 2 *varābas* for each foot-soldier.¹⁴ These figures indicate what a large amount had to be spent for defence. Army and public services were paid by grants of land or salaries.

Irrigation and public works were other main items of expenditure. The labour employed in these works was paid by grant of land. Cuddapah

9 *South Indian Inscriptions*, 409 of 1913.

10 *Ins. Ced. Dist.*, 150, 259.

11 *South Indian Inscriptions*, 409 of 1913.

12 *Ins. Ced. Dists.*, 340.

13 *SII.*, 561 of 1905.

14 *Rāya Vācakamu*, p. 34.

inscriptions mention the grant of five tūms of land for well-diggers in Bondalakunta.¹⁵

Personal expenditure of the king and the royal court was also large. That the canon of Yāmunaprabhu that the king should spend large sums for personal enjoyment and charity (one to keep himself in full vigour and the other to make himself popular and beloved of the people) was put in practice by Kṛṣṇa Rāya is borne out by the descriptions of the splendour of the Vijayanagara Court by foreigners like Nuniz and Paes. The charity and endowments of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya became proverbial and every inscription in his name in any temple invariably makes mention of some items. His patronage of architecture and literature is too well known to be detailed here at length.

The treasury was in a very sound condition when Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya succeeded to the throne. There was a sum of 118,66 lakhs cash in the treasury, of which 99,66 lakhs belonged to the money set apart by Vidyāranya as the capital "Nidhi" when the capital city was founded and the remaining amount of 19 crores was the surplus saved in the time of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya's predecessors. Besides these, there were jewels worth 4 crores and precious stones worth 6 crores.¹⁶ This shows the sound financial condition of the Vijayanagara empire at that time. Large sums of money were kept to meet emergencies like war, famine or pestilence.

Economic conditions of the empire

The economic condition of the people was good. The rich and luxurious dress, food and living of the people described by Nuniz and Paes and the high standard they maintained are familiar facts to every student of Vijayanagara history. Production was carried on and controlled by the organisation of guilds. Arts and crafts existed as individual concerns also. Agriculture and industries flourished on an equal scale. Foreign trade was carried on an extensive scale. The Bazaars were in a good condition. The market of the city of Vijayanagara was almost an international market which traders from the East and West visited frequently to carry on trade. The Italian and Portuguese travellers bear ample testimony to the flourishing trade carried on along the west coast of penin-

¹⁵ *Ins. Ced. Dist.*, 132-5.

¹⁶ *Rāya Vācakamu*, p. 34.

sular India. In matters of exchange there was the system of sale and contract. Some kinds of sales were recorded and registered. An inscription of north Arcot mentions the registration of the right of cultivation of temple land.¹⁷ The *varāha* might be taken as the money of account in those days. The coins of Vijayanagara were of various denominations and were of both gold and silver as detailed by Dr. Saletore. Different systems of land tenure existed and relics of some of those systems have lingered on to the present day in southern India. Interest was a recognised source of income. Wages were paid either in kind or by grants of land.

There are three important features in Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya's economic policy which are of great interest. Remission of taxes when the taxes became burdensome was a healthy feature of his financial administration. In one of the inscriptions at Bellary we find that he gave remission of the marriage tax throughout the empire. Secondly his frontier policy was of great economic interest. Thirdly, his financial administration was marked by a proper balance of public income and expenditure.

Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya was not merely a great statesman, emperor and patron of fine arts but also a great economist in the right sense of the word. Brought up in the school of ancient Hindu *Vārtā* and placed in the conditions existing in India after the advent of the Moslems, he adapted himself in such a way and shaped his policy in such form as was best conducive to the welfare of his people and to the sound condition of his treasury. His was a policy of well-blended "*tyāgam* (charity) and *bhōgam* (enjoyment). standing him and his empire in good stead.

Y. VENKATARAMANA

Epithets of an Arhat in the Divyāvadāna

Traidhātukavītarāgaḥ samaloṣṭakāñcana ākāśapāñitalasamacitto vāśican-
danakalpo vidyāvidāritāṇḍakośo vidyābbijñāḥ pratisaṃvitprāpto... This is
part of a list of epithets of one who has just become an arhat (*arhan sam-*
vyttah). It occurs at least nine times, four times in the *Divyāvadāna* and
five times in the *Avadānaśataka*. In *Divy.* it is found twice in the singular
(180, 282), once in the dual (551), and once in the plural (97). The above
form is where it occurs for the first time in the singular. Yet in spite of
these repetitions the editors have not made up their minds as to what
readings to adopt, and do not seem to have decided on the meaning.

It will be necessary to show first how the editors waver about the text.
The spelling *vāśicandanakalpo*, as given above (*Divy.* 180), is only a con-
jecture of the editors. The Mss. have *vāśi-* and *vāṭi-*. In all the other
instances the editors leave *vāśi-* in the text, but in the index they give both
spellings, showing that they leave the meaning undecided. Speyer is still
worse. In *Av. Śat.* I. 96, 7 his Ms. reads *vāśi-*, but he emended it to *vāsi-*.
Then in his index he goes back to *vāśi*, but does not say why, and in I. 104.
7 he prints *vāsi* as a separate word. He ignores the conjecture *vāśi*. Yet
when the editors of *Divy.* suggested *vāśi-* one would suppose that they
thought it to give a better meaning, and that when Speyer rejected it he
had a reason for going back to the Ms. reading.

The index of *Divy.* gives *aṇḍakośa* as 'cocoen of ignorance' with a
query. One meaning of *aṇḍakośa*, however, is 'egg-shell' (instances in
Pāli), and the whole word is *vidyā-vidāritāṇḍakośo*, 'with knowledge-broken
egg-shell,' which might mean 'whose egg-shell is broken by knowledge.'
But there is nothing to show that *aṇḍakośa* means ignorance, except that this
meaning seems to fit. However, in *Divy.* 551, 19 the reading is *avidyā-*.
This would be a possibility in all the other passages, but then they should be
printed '*vidyā-*, or there should be some explanation of the solitary *avidyā-*
in 551, 19. It seems clear that the editors were not decided about either
the reading or the meaning.

Vidyābbijñāḥ. Here too they are not decided. In *Divy.* 97, 26 they
read *vijñāḥ* (plur.) with *vidyā* joined to the previous word. But a word
merely meaning knowing or intelligent is not a significant epithet in a list

of an arhat's qualities. Still, the fact that it is given once in the text shows how far the editors were from making up their minds. Two possible readings remain, one which makes *vidyābbhijñāḥ* a separate word, and the other which combines it with the next, *vidyābbhijñā-pratisaṃvit-prāpto*. But here are two different words. *Abbhijñāḥ*, occurring in *vidyābbhijñāḥ*, would mean 'thoroughly understanding (the knowledge),' but in the second case we have not an adjective but the noun *abbhijñā*, 'higher knowledge,' of which there are six possessed by an arhat. Here again the reading is left undecided.

It may be said in favour of the editors that whatever readings are chosen some of them yield no intelligible sense. My suggestion is that the words have been wrongly divided. In that case it will have to be held that the scribes themselves did not always know the meaning. This seems probable, as the words are full of figures of speech, and may have been taken from some stotra.

It will at least be a step forward if it can be shown that intelligible meanings can be found, and that little more is needed for this than a different division of words. In *vāṣī-candana-kalpo* there is no reason for *vāṣī-*, unless it can be shown that *vāṣī-candana* is a particular kind of sandal. *Candana-kalpa* is 'like, or behaving like, sandal.' Sandal is well-known as a refrigerant, and is mentioned as such in *Divy.* 508, 28, where in a verse passage it is said to have the quality of coolness, *śaityaguṇo hi candanaraso*. However, it is not the arhat himself who has cooling qualities. The coolness is produced by the state of knowledge, when the arhat becomes *traiḍbhātuka-vītarāga*, free from passion for the three worlds. If *vidyā* from the next word is joined on we get an intelligible epithet of an arhat, *candanakalpa-vidyo*, 'whose knowledge acts like sandal.' *Vāṣī* can be disposed of by adding it to the previous word, *ākāśapāṇitalasamacitta*. This, taken by itself, means, 'whose mind is the same towards space and the palm of the hand,' and practically no difference results from adding *vāṣī*, for *samacitta-vāsin* is 'dwelling with an even mind.'

This leaves the next word without the initial *vidyā-*, and what remains is *vidāritāṇḍakośo*, 180.20, or *vidāritāṇḍakośāvidyā* (plur.) 97.26. The latter combination is only what struck the fancy of the editors, but it may be a preservation of the real division. In that case we get for the singular *vidāritāṇḍakośāvidyo*, and then the last element of the compound is *avidyā*. The

result is an at least permissible description of an arhat, 'in whom ignorance is a broken egg-shell.'

We are thus freed in the next word from the weak epithet *vidyābbijñāḥ*, and *abbijñāḥ*, which is left, is found only once (and in a corrupt form as *vijñāḥ*). It may be discarded for the much better attested *abbijñāpratisamvitprāpto*. This is in fact the only reading found in *Av.Sat*. It gives a clear, technical description of the arhat 'who has attained the (six) higher knowledges and the (four) analytical knowledges.'

The highly figurative nature of some of these terms gives them a poetical aspect, but it is unlikely that the passage is intended to be wholly metrical, as it occurs in the singular, dual, and plural. Some of it almost fits into an āryā scheme, and this may be due to dependence on phrases from some stotra. It would not be surprising that the scribes should have divided suffixes in the wrong places.

In the first word *traidhātuka-* looks like a poetical adaptation of *traidhātuloka*. The second, *samaloṣṭakāñcana* is almost paralleled by *samaloṣṭakāñcana* of the *Ġītā*, VI, 18, and *samacitta* is paralleled in the *Ġītā* by *samabuddhi*, VI, 19 and *samadarśin*, V, 18. *Vidāntāṇḍakośāvidyō* is another figurative expression, about the division of which the scribes were uncertain, and without more knowledge of its source it cannot be treated as final. The egg-simile occurs several times in Pāli (*A.* iv, 126 etc.), where the hatching of chickens from eggs is made a simile of the disciple winning release. Just as the hen thinks, 'would that my chickens with claw or beak may break through the egg-shell,' so the monk intent on discipline thinks, 'would that my mind free from clinging may be released from the āsavas.' Here the point of comparison is not the egg-shell but the striving of the chickens. The egg-shell simile also occurs in an Udāna (*Divy.* 203), where Buddha decides to live only three months longer, and shakes off his aggregate of rebirth. 'So he broke it as the bird (the egg-creature) breaks its shell,' *abhinat koṣam ivāñḍasambhavaḥ*. Here there is no breaking of the shell of ignorance but of the *bhavasamskāra*, which if it had not been broken would have kept him in existence for the rest of the kalpa. This Udāna occurs in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* (*D.* ii, 107) and in several other parts of the Pāli Nikāyas, but there the shell is replaced by a coat of mail (*kavaca*). Which reading was the original does not concern us, as it is practically certain that the form mentioning the egg-shell was that known to the

authors of the Avadānas. The Pāli commentaries always explain it without any reference to the egg-simile, but it is curious that in the *Nettipakaraṇa* under the category *Paññatti* (p. 61) the words *abhūta kavacaṃ* are explained as aversion of mind, grasping at omniscience and breaking of the egg-shells of ignorance, *padālanā avijjāṇḍakosānaṃ*. These examples however show that *ṇḍakośa* without any qualification has no doctrinal significance, and does not in itself refer to ignorance. They thus favour the emendation of *vidyāvidāntāṇḍakośo* (where *ṇḍakośa* is left undefined) into the form suggested above.

E. J. THOMAS

Date of the earliest Sanskrit Inscription of Campā

In a note in *JGIS.*, VI, p. 57 f., the date "2nd or 3rd century A.D.," to which the Vo cañh inscription is assigned by scholars on palaeographic grounds, was considered by me to be too early. The record is composed in a developed Kāvya style and in the ornate Sanskrit metre Vasantatilakā. As I have elsewhere tried to show,¹ Sanskrit was originally a priestly language and was not popular at Indian courts before the Gupta epoch. Its origin may be traced in North-west India, whence it gradually came down towards the east, its popularity having been due to foreigners. The evidence of the Junāgaḍh inscription of Śaka Rudradāman (150 A.D.), the Ayodhyā inscription of Dhanadeva (not much earlier than the 1st century A.D.), etc. shows that Sanskrit was sometimes, though very rarely, used in inscriptions during the early centuries of the Christian era in the North-western quarter of India upto Ayodhyā in the east and Avanti in the south; but Prakrit was predominantly the court language even in this part of the country till about the beginning of the fourth century A.D. Prakrit was the language of the royal records of that period in all other parts of India; it was supplanted by Sanskrit in South India only about the middle of the fourth century.² An ornate metre, the Śārdūlavikrīḍita, is found in the Junāgaḍh inscription of Śaka Jīvaḍāman (279 A.D.); but the language of

¹ *IHQ.*, XV, p. 38 ff.

² Sircar, *The Successors of the Śātavāhanas*, Calcutta, 1939, p. 166 ff.

the record is much influenced by Prakrit.³ That Sanskrit was not popular even at the Śaka courts is proved by the fact that the inscriptions and coin-legends of Rudradāman and his successors are largely in Prakrit.⁴ If the Vo-cañh inscription is assigned to the "2nd or 3rd century A.D.," we fail to understand why classical Sanskrit and the ornate metre, which were only rarely used in a particular portion of India, became the predominant epigraphic language and style in the Far Eastern countries. The Vo-cañh record thus appeared to me to be not earlier than the fourth century A.D.

In a note in *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 484 ff., Dr. G. Cœdès has criticised my views and has drawn our attention to the following facts:—

(1) the "box-headed" alphabet of the 5th century was diffused to the Far Eastern countries with astonishing rapidity;

(2) Lüders has published a Mathurā Brāhmī inscription of the time of Soḍāsa, which is in classical Sanskrit and in the ornate metre *Bhujāṅgaviṃśbhūta*.⁵ This record together with the Junṅgaḍh inscription would mark in Indian epigraphy the victory of Sanskrit over Prakrit;

(3) Śrī-Māra at whose order the Vo-cañh inscription was composed" is to be identified with Fan-She-man of the Chinese annals, who was king of Fou-nan in the end of the 2nd or the beginning of the 3rd century A.D., and not with K'iu Lien (from A.D. 192) as proposed by M. G. Maspero and supported by M. S. Sugimoto. In that case, the Vo-cañh record cannot be later than 230 A.D.

As regards the first argument, it may be pointed out that the "box-headed" alphabet cannot be called a 5th century script. Its great popularity during the 4th century in Central India is proved by such records as the Eran pillar inscription of Samudragupta and the Basim copper plate grant of Vākātaka Vindhyāsakti II. Central Indian epigraphs of the 3rd century are rare; but the fourth century finds prove that the diffusion of the

3 *IC.*, VI, p. 110 ff. Later I have noticed a Mathurā Sanskrit record of the 1st century A.D. written in the *Śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre (*EI*, II, p. 200, no. 7).

4 Cf. Rapson, *Catalogue*, p. 72 ff.

5 *Seven Brāhmī Inscriptions from Mathurā and its Vicinity*, (?), 1938, p. 194 ff.

6 The passages however appear to indicate that the record belongs to one of the family of Śrīmāra who is therefore earlier than the record. The person responsible for the Vo-cañh record is called an ornament of the Śrī-Māraṅjakula and a delighter of the family of king Śrī-Māra.

“box-headed” script in the Far East was not so rapid as supposed by Dr. Cœdès.

As to the inscription of Śaka Śoḍāsa who ruled in 15 A.D., we are referred to more than a century earlier than the time of Rudradāman; but this record certainly does not prove the popularity of Sanskrit or the victory of Sanskrit over Prakrit in Indian epigraphy during the 1st century A.D., as other records and coin-legends of Śoḍāsa himself are in Prakrit.⁷ It only proves that classical Sanskrit and the ornate metre were rarely used in some parts of India during the 1st century A.D.; but this was suggested by other epigraphs. Of course, if it can be proved that the Hindu civilisation of the Far Eastern countries was due to the priestly class especially of the Mathurā region, the evidence of Śoḍāsa’s inscription may offer an argument, though not a very strong one, in favour of an early date of the Vo-cañh inscription. In my opinion, however, the popularity in the Far Eastern countries of the ‘box-headed’ alphabet, the ‘Śaka’ era and names ending in ‘*varman*’, and the *Āsvatthāman* tradition in the back ground of the cultural history of both Campā and Kambuja speak against any such idea.

With reference to the identification of Śrī-Māra with Fan-She-man, Dr. Cœdès says, “As regards *Fan*, it is wellknown that it is an equivalent of the termination of royal names with *varman*, interpreted by the Chinese as the name of family.” The learned scholar thus believes in the existence of a Varman dynasty (i.e. a line of kings with names ending in *varman*) in Campā in the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D. This, however, is not only a conjecture, but appears to go against evidence. The popularity of names ending in *varman* was rather late in India, where there was no important royal dynasty of Varmans as late as the early centuries of the Christian era. There is no noteworthy epic hero whose name ends in *varman*, and such names are rarely found in the older sections of the epics and the Purāṇas. Epigraphs of the early centuries of the Christian era do not speak of any important Varman dynasty, with the exception of a viceregal line represented by Indravarman, Aspavarman and Sasa.⁸ Names with *varman* are found popular in India from the 4th century A.D. It is interesting to note that the Smṛti injunction regarding distinctive names for the different Varnas has

7 Cf. Smith, *Catalogue*, p. 195 ff.

8 Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 1938, p. 370 Note however that the last name is not Sasavarman.

the record is much influenced by Prakrit.³ That Sanskrit was not popular even at the Śaka courts is proved by the fact that the inscriptions and coin-legends of Rudradāman and his successors are largely in Prakrit.⁴ If the Vo-cañh inscription is assigned to the "2nd or 3rd century A.D.," we fail to understand why classical Sanskrit and the ornate metre, which were only rarely used in a particular portion of India, became the predominant epigraphic language and style in the Far Eastern countries. The Vo-cañh record thus appeared to me to be not earlier than the fourth century A.D.

In a note in *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 484 ff., Dr. G. Cœdès has criticised my views and has drawn our attention to the following facts:—

(1) the "box-headed" alphabet of the 5th century was diffused to the Far Eastern countries with astonishing rapidity;

(2) Lüders has published a Mathurā Brāhmī inscription of the time of Śoḍāsa, which is in classical Sanskrit and in the ornate metre *Bhujāṅgavijṛmbhita*.⁵ This record together with the Junīgadh inscription would mark in Indian epigraphy the victory of Sanskrit over Prakrit;

(3) Śrī-Māra at whose order the Vo-cañh inscription was composed⁶ is to be identified with Fan-She-man of the Chinese annals, who was king of Fou-nan in the end of the 2nd or the beginning of the 3rd century A.D., and not with K'iu Lien (from A.D. 192) as proposed by M. G. Maspero and supported by M. S. Sugimoto. In that case, the Vo-cañh record cannot be later than 230 A.D.

As regards the first argument, it may be pointed out that the "box-headed" alphabet cannot be called a 5th century script. Its great popularity during the 4th century in Central India is proved by such records as the Eran pillar inscription of Samudragupta and the Basim copper plate grant of Vākātaka Vindhyasakti II. Central Indian epigraphs of the 3rd century are rare; but the fourth century finds prove that the diffusion of the

3 *I.C.*, VI, p. 110 ff. Later I have noticed a Mathurā Sanskrit record of the 1st century A.D. written in the Śārdūlavikrīḍita metre (*E.I.*, II, p. 200, no. 7).

4 Cf. Rapson, *Catalogue*, p. 72 ff.

5 *Seven Brāhmī Inscriptions from Mathurā and its Vicinity*, (?), 1938, p. 194 ff.

6 The passages however appear to indicate that the record belongs to one of the family of Śrīmāra who is therefore earlier than the record. The person responsible for the Vo-cañh record is called an ornament of the Śrī-Māraṅjakula and a delighter of the family of king Śrī-Māra.

“box-headed” script in the Far East was not so rapid as supposed by Dr. Cœdès.

As to the inscription of Śaka Śoḍāsa who ruled in 15 A.D., we are referred to more than a century earlier than the time of Rudradāman; but this record certainly does not prove the popularity of Sanskrit or the victory of Sanskrit over Prakrit in Indian epigraphy during the 1st century A.D., as other records and coin-legends of Śoḍāsa himself are in Prakrit.⁷ It only proves that classical Sanskrit and the ornate metre were rarely used in some parts of India during the 1st century A.D.; but this was suggested by other epigraphs. Of course, if it can be proved that the Hindu civilisation of the Far Eastern countries was due to the priestly class especially of the Mathurā region, the evidence of Śoḍāsa’s inscription may offer an argument, though not a very strong one, in favour of an early date of the Vo-cañh inscription. In my opinion, however, the popularity in the Far Eastern countries of the ‘box-headed’ alphabet, the ‘Śaka’ era and names ending in ‘*varman*’, and the *Āśvatthāman* tradition in the back ground of the cultural history of both Campā and Kambuja speak against any such idea.

With reference to the identification of Śrī-Māra with Fan-She-man, Dr. Cœdès says, “As regards *Fan*, it is wellknown that it is an equivalent of the termination of royal names with *varman*, interpreted by the Chinese as the name of family.” The learned scholar thus believes in the existence of a Varman dynasty (i.e. a line of kings with names ending in *varman*) in Campā in the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D. This, however, is not only a conjecture, but appears to go against evidence. The popularity of names ending in *varman* was rather late in India, where there was no important royal dynasty of Varmans as late as the early centuries of the Christian era. There is no noteworthy epic hero whose name ends in *varman*, and such names are rarely found in the older sections of the epics and the Purāṇas. Epigraphs of the early centuries of the Christian era do not speak of any important Varman dynasty, with the exception of a viceregal line represented by Indravarman, Aspavarman and Sasa.⁸ Names with *varman* are found popular in India from the 4th century A.D. It is interesting to note that the Smṛti injunction regarding distinctive names for the different Vārṇas has

7 Cf. Smith, *Catalogue*, p. 195 ff.

8 Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 1938, p. 370 Note however that the last name is not Sasavarman.

its germ in the *Manusamhitā* (not earlier than the 3rd or 4th century), which has been expanded by the later Nibandhakāras." The popularity of Varman names in Far Eastern countries could have been borrowed from India, probably from South India, after the 3rd century A.D.¹⁰

In these circumstances we are not convinced that the date of the Vo-cañh inscription is earlier than the 4th century A.D. With reference to the palaeographical difficulty, it may be pointed out that even in India the Mathurā inscription of Candragupta II dated in 380 A.D. is written in the Kuṣāṇa script of the 2nd century A.D.¹¹

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

The Vatsagulma Copper-plate Grant of King Vindhyaśakti II

In my note¹ on the Vatsagulma grant of the Vākāṭaka king Vindhyaśakti, son of Sarvasena and grandson of Pravarasena, I referred to a paper on the same grant read by Mr. Y. K. Deshpande before the Third Session of the Indian History Congress, Calcutta, 1939. That paper by Messrs. Y. K. Deshpande and D. B. Mahajan has now been published in the *Proceedings* of the Session, p. 449 ff., with plates. The text and translation of the record as published by the authors do not appear to be convincing in all places. I am therefore inclined to publish my own reading and translation, though the plates published in the *Proceedings* are not quite satisfactory for the purpose.

In this connection, readers may be referred to my previous paper on the subject, wherein I have tried to prove:

- (1) that Pravarasena, grandfather of the king who issued the Vatsagulma grant, should be identified with Pravarasena I (son of Vindhyaśakti I, founder of the Vākāṭaka dynasty);

9 *IHQ.*, XV, p. 636; *op. cit.*, p. 228. It must be noted that Brahmanic names ending in *śarman* are also not found in early inscriptions and in the older sections of the epics. Stray Brāhmaṇa names with *śarman* and Kṣatriya names with *varman* in early Indian literature again would not prove either the popularity of such names or the existence of Varman dynasties.

10 For some early Varman kings of South India, see Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 390 ff.

11 *E.I.*, XXI, p. 1 ff.

1 *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 182 ff.

- (2) that Vindhyaśakti II who issued the charter was the great-grand-son of Vindhyaśakti I; and
- (3) that Sarvasena and Vindhyaśakti II either ruled side by side with the kings of the main line represented by Rudrasena I or they both ruled over the Vākāṭaka kingdom between Pravarasena I and Rudrasena I.

With reference to the third point, it was remarked,² "Of course the Puranic tradition regarding the four sons of Pravīra (=Pravarasena I) may indicate a division of the kingdom after Pravarasena I. But the tradition has not yet been corroborated. Gautamīputra however does not appear to have ruled. It is therefore tempting to suggest that Sarvavarman and Vindhyaśakti II ruled the Vākāṭaka kingdom after Pravarasena I and before Rudrasena I." Further consideration however suggests that the Puranic tradition may have some basis of truth. It is interesting to note in this connection that some of the provinces of the Vākāṭaka kingdom were designated by the term *rājya*.³ This fact may indicate that the kingdom was previously divided into several *rājyas*. It may also be noted that in the Riddhapur grant,⁴ line 10, Prabhāvatīguptā has been called वाक्राटकानाम्महाराज-श्रीदामोदरसेन-प्रवरसेन-जननी, which may be translated "mother of Dāmodarasena and Pravarasena (who are) illustrious (and are) Mahārājas belonging to (the family of) the Vākāṭakas." The non-mention of Prabhāvatī's other son, Yuvarāja Divākarasena,⁵ who might have died before the date of the Riddhapur grant, appears to suggest that both Dāmodarasena and Pravarasena II were living at this time and were ruling in different parts of the Vākāṭaka country as Mahārājas. In other words, the passage quoted from the Riddhapur grant may indicate that the kingdom of Rudrasena II had been divided between his two sons. If this suggestion be accepted, the Puranic statement⁶ that the four sons of Pravīra (=Pravarasena I) became kings may not be altogether baseless.

² *Loc. cit.*, p. 186.

³ Bhojakāṭa-rājya in the Chamnak grant, line 18, *CII*, III, p. 237; Ārammī-rājya in the Dudia grant, line 13, *EI*, III, p. 261. I am indebted for the suggestion to Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri.

⁴ *JPASB.*, N.S., XX, p. 58. ⁵ Cf. the Poona grant, *EL*, XV, p. 41.

⁶ तस्य पुत्राश्च चत्वारो भविष्यन्ति नराधिपाः । वायुपुराण । ६६।३७।

As regards my remarks⁷ about the draft of the genealogical portion of the Vākātaka grants,⁸ I now find that it resembles the draft of the Gupta records.⁹ Cf.

Gupta:— श्रीषटोत्कचपौत्रस्य—श्रीचन्द्रगुप्तपुत्रस्य—

श्रीसमुद्रगुप्तस्य पुत्रः—श्रीचन्द्रगुप्तः तस्य पुत्रः—श्रीकुमारगुप्तः तस्य...

Vākātaka:—प्रवरसेनस्य सूनोः सूनोः (=पौत्रस्य)—गांतमीपुत्रस्य पुत्रस्य—

श्रीरुद्रसेनस्य सूनोः—श्रीवृथिवीदेशस्य सूनोः—श्रीरुद्रसेनस्य...

The similarity of the position of Samudragupta to that of Rudrasena I in the drafts is noticeable.

TEXT¹⁰

1ST PLATE

[दृष्टम्]¹¹

सिद्धम्¹²

- १ वत्सगुल्माद्धर्ममहाराजस्य[१]मिश्रोम[१]सोय्याम-वाजपेय-ज्यो[ति].
- २ [श्रो]म-बृहस्पतिसव साद्यस्क-चतुरश्वमेध-याजिनस्सम्राज[ः*] वृ-
- ३ धिणवृद्ध¹³-सगोत्रस्य हारिती¹⁴-पुत्रस्य श्र[१]-प्रवरसेन[स्य*] पौत्रस्य
- ४ धर्ममहारा[१*]जस्य श्री-सर्व्वसेन[स्य*] पुत्रस्य धर्ममह[१]राजस्य
- ५ वाकाटकाना[म] श्रि-¹⁵विन्ध्यशक्तोर्व्वचनात्¹⁶ नान्दीकडस उत्तर-¹⁷म[गगे]

2ND PLATE: 1ST SIDE

2¹⁸

- ६ भाकालक्खोप्पकाब्भासे आकासपद्दे सु अ[म्ह]-सन्तका साव्वा[द्धक्ख*नि*]योग-नि-
- ७ युत्ता आणत्ति-भडा सेसाय-साश्चरन्त-रलपुत्ता¹⁹ भाणितव्वा [१*] आम्हेहि
- ८ दाणि आपुणो विजय-वेजयिके आयु-बल-वद्धणिके [स्व]स्ति-

7 *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 185.

8 *CII.*, III, p. 245.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 53

10 From the photo-prints published in the *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Calcutta, 1939.*

11 In the left margin in the level of line 1.

12 In the left margin in the level of line 3

13 Other Vākātaka records read विष्णुवृद्ध

14 Better read हारीती

15 Read श्री

16 From here the rest of the record is in Prakrit.

17 उ has been engraved on the *akṣara* दा which was originally engraved.

18 In the left margin a little above the level of line 8.

19 Read कुलपुत्ता ; cf. आज्ञासञ्चारिकुलपुत्ता: of other Vākātaka records. त्ता looks like न्ता on the plate.

- ६ शान्ति²⁰-वाचने इहामुत्तिके²¹ धाम्मत्थाणे एत्थङ्गामे आधिब्वणिक-चर-
१० एस्स आद्धक ।²² भालन्दायण सगोत्तेसि²³ [सि] तुज्जेसि कापिञ्चल-

2ND PLATE: 2ND SIDE

- ११ सगोत्तेसि । रुहज्जेसि । आविप्रायण-सगोत्तेसि । भाट्टिदेवज्जेसि
१२ कोसि[क]सगोत्तेसि ।²⁴ देसुज्जेसि । कोसिक-सगोत्तेसि । वेणहुज्जेसि ।
१३ कोसीक-सगोत्तेसि । विधिज्जेसि । पैप्पलादि-सगोत्तेसि पितु-
१४ जेसि भालन्दायण-सगोत्तेसि चान्दजेसि कोसिक-सगोत्तेसि जेट्जे-
१५ सि । पडेहि दोहि भालन्दायण-सगोत्तेसि बुद्धजेसि कोसिक-सगोत्तेसि

3RD PLATE: 1ST SIDE

3²⁵

- १६ भाहिलज्जेसि । कोसिक-सगोत्तेसि । सिवज्जेसि । कोसिक-सगोत्तेसि
१७ हरिणजेसि एताण बाम्हणाण भागा ति[f] गण ३ कोसिक-सगोत्ते[f] स
१८ रेवतिजेसि । भागो । चउत्थोत्ति आचन्दादिच्च-कालको अपुव्व-द-
१९ त्तिय दत्तो । [1*] पूव्व-रायाणुमते यसे चातुव्वेज्ज-ग्गाम-मज्जात[f] परिहारो वित-
२० राम[1*] तजथा अरट्ठ-संविणोयिक । अ-लवण-[क्के] गण-खातक । अहिरगण-
धा[रण]-

3RD PLATE: 2ND SIDE

- २१ प्पणय प्पदेय । अ-पुप्फ-क्खीर-ग्गहणि²⁶ । अ-पारम्पर-गो-बलिवद्
२२ अ-वार-सिद्धिक । अ-चम्मज्जालक । अ-भड-प्पावेस । अ-खट्टा-चोत्तक-वेणो-
२३ सिक । अ-करद । अ-वह । स-निधि । सोपनिधि । स-कुतुप्पान्त ।
२४ स-मच्च-सहाकरण । साव्व-जाति-परिहार-परिहितच्च [1*] जतो उपरि-लि-
२५ खित । शासण-वादम्पमाण करेत्ता रक्खध रक्खापेधय परिहरध

20 न्ति looks like त्ति on the plate. 21 त्ति looks like न्ति on the plate.

22 These half-stops are sometimes superfluous. They look more or less like crescents generally put just below the level of the line.

23 Locative terminations appear to have been used in these cases for dative.

24 Traces of an erased f sign are noticed above स.

25 In the left margin in the level of line 18.

26 Possibly ण्ण was intended.

4TH PLATE

4²⁷

- २६ परिहरापेधय [१*] जोबु^{२८} [आ]बाधं करेज्ज कतव्व [अ]नुवरण[ति](१)
 २७ तिस्स [ए]तेहि । उपरिलिखितेहि । बाम्हणेहि । परिअपिते स दण्ड-
 २८ निग्रह करेज्जामेत्ति [१*] साव्वच्छरं ३०[+*] १ हेमन्त-पक्खं पढम
 २९ दिवस ५[१*] स-मुहायसत्थि^{२९} [१*] लीखितमिमं शासनं सेनापतिना
 ३० वरहुना^{३०} इति ॥ सिद्धिरस्तु ॥ [A four-petalled lotus symbol]||

TRANSLATION

Seen.³¹

Success.

Lines 1-5. From VAISAGULMA,³² by order of the illustrious VINDHYAŚAKTI; the *Dharma-mahārāja*³³ belonging to (the family of) the Vākāṭakas; son of the *Dharma-mahārāja*, the illustrious SARVASENA; grandson of the *Dharmamahārāja*, the illustrious PRAVARASENA, son of Hārīti, belonging to the Viṣṇuvṛddha gotra, the Emperor, performer of the *Agniṣṭoma*, *Āptoryyāma*, *Vājapeya*, *Jyotiṣṭoma*, *Brhaspatisava*, *Sādyaskra* and four *Āvamedhas*;

Lines 5-7. (the officers) belonging to Uś³⁴ and employed in the offices (of all superintendents), the soldiers at our command, the spies³⁵ and nobles under

27 In the left margin a little below the level of line 28.

28 Possibly वा or तु was intended.

29 The reading is not beyond doubt; but the expression seems to be the same as Sanskrit स्वमुखाक्षम; cf. *CII*, III, p. 100, note 3

30 Read वेरहु as in line 12.

31 See Sircar, *Successors of the Śātavāhanas*, Calcutta University, 1939, pp. 188-89.

32 Basim in the Akola district, Berar. The Vātsagulmakas (people of Vatsagulma) are mentioned in Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra*, V, 6, 35 and also in some other works. For Vākāṭaka Devasena's grant issued from Vatsagulma, see *NIA.*, 1939, p. 256 ff., *ibid.*, 1940.

33 See Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 171, note 1.

34 सन्दक is a Pāli word meaning "belonging to."

35 See Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

orders (?), (assembled) in (the localities called) Ākāśapadra in the vicinity of Bhākālakkhoppaka³⁶ (and) on the northern road of Nāndikata,³⁷ should be informed:—

Lines 7-18 the half share (of Ākāśapadra),³⁸ (allotted to persons belonging to) the *Ātharvanika-carāṇa* in this village, is granted at the *Dbarmasthāna* as a grant not previously made, to last as long as the moon and sun endure, for our own victory and gain, for the increase of our longevity and strength, for good wishes and blessings, for the sake of our welfare in this world and the next, (in the following order):—

To Situ-ārya of the Bhālandāyana *gotra*, Rudrārya of the Kāpiñjala *gotra*, Bhartrdevārya of the Śrāviṣṭhāyana *gotra*, Desu-ārya of the Kauśika *gotra*, Viṣṇvārya of the Kauśika *gotra*, Vidhyārya of the Kauśika *gotra*, Pitrārya of the Paippalādi *gotra*, Candrārya of the Bhālandāyana *gotra*, Jyeṣṭhārya of the Kauśika *gotra*, by two paṭas³⁹ (each), to Buddhārya of the Bhālandāyana *gotra*, Bhadrilārya of the Kauśika *gotra*, Śivārya of the Kauśika *gotra*, Hariṇṇ-ārya (Hiraṇyārya?) of the Kauśika *gotra*—to these Brāhmanas three—3—shares; to Revatyārya of the Kauśika *gotra* the fourth (of a) share.

Lines 19-20. We grant for this (land) exemptions which are in accordance with customs⁴⁰ followed (in granting) villages to (Brāhmaṇas) versed in the four Vedas, (and) which have been approved of by former kings.

Lines 20-24 They are—no interference by the district police (?);⁴¹ no digging out of salt and (other) moist substances; no benevolence⁴² in (the shape of) gold or corn to be paid (to the royal treasury); no flower and milk to be taken (by the royal officers);⁴³ no cows and bullocks in succession;⁴⁴ no (obligation regarding) the completion (of duty) in turn; no (obligation regarding the supply of) hide and charcoal; no entry for soldiers; no (obligation regarding supply of) cots,

36 The expression seem to indicate more than one locality.

37 Identified with Nāndēḍ in the Nizami's dominions.

38 Cf. *CII.*, III, p. 131, text line 8.

39 Possibly the same as *paṭi* or *pāṭaka* of many inscriptions.

40 Cf. ब्रह्मदेय-मर्यादा : Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 200, 210, 293.

41 *Ibid.*, p. 186.

42 For *praṇaya*, see Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, V, 2.

43 Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 192-93.

44 *Ibid.*, pp. 186-87.

116 *The Vatsagulma Copper-plate Grant of King Vindhyāsakti II*

cooking pots and fuel (?);⁴⁵ no rent to be paid (to the king); no (obligation regarding) carrying (loads free of charge); with (the right of enjoying) hidden treasures and deposits, together with fields covered with *kūśa* grass (?) (and) with big fields having elevated shades; (the grant) is exempted with all kinds of exemptions.

Lines 24-28. Therefore, having accepted the words of the above charter as authoritative, you should observe them and prompt (others) to observe; you should exempt (the grant) and prompt (others) to exempt (it); whoever would cause disturbance (to the donees) (or) praise (that as) duty, him we shall restrain by punishment, if informed by these Brāhmaṇas mentioned above.

Lines 28-30 The (regnal) year 37, the first fortnight of winter, the (fifth) day 5. Order from (the king's) own mouth (?). This charter is written by the *Senāpati*⁴⁶ Viṣṇu.

Let there be success.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

⁴⁶ Literally "head of army", "commander", "general"; but the *senāpatis* of the Vākātaka kings were generally Provincial Governors or High Commissioners. *Senāpati* Namidāsa e.g., was probably Governor of the Ārammi-rājya under Pravarasena II (Cf. Dudia grant, lines 13, 28-29), while *Senāpati* Citravarma may have been the king's High Commissioner for the Bhojakatarājya under the feudatory Satrugṇarāja or Koṇḍarāja.

Date of the Kalacuri Kokkala I

No record issued by the first three Kalacuri rulers of Tripuri has come to light so far, therefore the history of their reign is constructed mainly with the help of the records left by the later kings of the dynasty. References to Kokkala I's achievements are made only by three inscriptions of the family. The first, namely the Bilhari Stone inscription of the Śaiva ascetics of the Mattamayūra sect states: "Having conquered the whole earth he (Kokkala I) set up two unprecedented columns of his fame in the quarter of the pitcher-born (Agastya, = South) that well known Kṛṣṇarāja and in the quarter of Kuvera (North) Bhojadeva, a store of fortune."¹ The second i.e. the Benares Copper plates of the Cedi Karnadeva, lays down "The hand of Kokkala (I) granted freedom from fear to Bhoja, Vallabharāja, the illustrious Harṣa, the lord of Citrakūṭa and king Śaṅkaragaṇa."² Both these inscriptions were edited by Prof. Kielhorn who identified Kṛṣṇarāja or Vallabharāja with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa II (Akālavarṣa c. 878 to 912 A.D.), Bhoja with the Pratihāra Bhoja I, the Citrakūṭa Bhūpāla Harṣa with the Candella Harṣa (c. 915-940 A.D.) and Śaṅkaragaṇa with his own son of that name.

Late Mr. R. D. Banerji while writing on the Kalacuris of Tripuri accepted³ all identifications except the second, viz., that of Bhoja with Mihira Bhoja. His objection was that a prince who was a contemporary of Candella Harṣa consequently a contemporary of the Pratihāra Bhoja II and Mahīpāla, necessarily cannot defeat or assist their grand-father, Mihira Bhoja. Therefore he should be identified with the Pratihāra Bhoja II. This view is also supported by Dr. H. C. Ray⁴ and Dr. R. S. Tripathi.⁵ They think that Kokkala I who was a petty upstart possibly could not have measured his sword against a mighty emperor like Mihira Bhoja (c. 836 to 885 A.D.).

After a critical study of the above mentioned two inscriptions in the light of the lately published Amoda plates of the Haihaya king Pṛthvīdeva I,

¹ जित्वां कृतज्ञां येन पृथ्वीमपूर्वकीर्तिस्तम्भद्वन्द्वमारोप्यते स्म । कुम्भोद्भव्यान्दिश्यसौ
कृष्णराजः कोवेर्याश्च श्रीनिधिर्भोजदेवः ॥ v. 17, *El.*, vol. I, p. 256.

² भोजे वल्लभराजे श्रीहर्षे चित्तकूटभूपाले । शङ्करगणे च राजनि यस्यासीदभयदः
पाणिः ॥ v. 7, *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 306.

³ *MASt.*, No. 23, p. 4.

⁴ *DHNI.*, vol. II, p. 754.

⁵ *History of Kanauja*, p. 251.

wherein it is narrated that "That king (Kokkala I) erected the pillar of victory after having wrested the treasures, horses and elephants of the Karṇāṭa, Vaṅga, Gurjjara, Koṅkaṇa, Śākambharī kings and also of those born of the Turuṣka and Raghu families."⁶ Dr. D. C. Ganguli⁷ has recently published an article on the 'Early Cedis,' in which by a scientific calculation based on the genealogies supplied by the Rāṣṭrakūta records⁸ he has proved that Kokkala I might have ascended the throne before about 840 A.D. and was a mighty king whose campaign covered a vast area. According to him it is most unlikely that Kokkala I who was born some time before 816 A.D. was a contemporary of Bhoja II who flourished between A.D. 909 and 914. Thus he has established that it was the Pratihāra Bhoja I whom Kokkala I granted freedom from fear and the illustrious Harṣa was a Guhila prince not the Candella Harṣa who is said to have raised his Pratihāra overlord to the throne of Kanauj.

But Dr. Ganguli has failed to notice one more decisive evidence in support of the theory formerly established by Prof. Kielhorn. It is furnished by the drama (*nāṭikā*) *Viddhaśālībhaṇjikā*⁹ by Rājasekhara, the poet laureate in the Pratihāra court. The plot can be summarized as follows:—King Candravarmā of Lāṭa having no male issue sends his daughter Mrgāṅkavati in disguise of a son named Mrgāṅkavarmā to the queen consort of Vidyādhara Malla. The prime minister of the Vidyādhara king discovers the secret and allows love to grow between them. Afterwards they are married and Vidyādhara Malla becomes king.

This *nāṭikā* was written to amuse Yuvarājadeva seated in the assembly because the author says in his prologue 'I do not know today the orders of the assembly of Yuvarājadeva.' Next he says 'Therefore I suppose that the assembly of Śrī Yuvarājadeva sanctions the representation of that (drama i.e. *Viddhaśālībhaṇjikā*.)'¹⁰ Formerly this Yuvarājadeva was identified with the Pratihāra Mahipāla because Rājasekhara has mentioned his father as his

6 कर्णाटवज्रपतिगूजर्जरकोङ्कणेशशाकम्भरीपतिगुह्यरघुद्वानां । आदाय कोशहरिन्दित
चयंहठेन स्तम्भो जयस्य विहितो भुवि येन राजा ॥ v. 5. *EL.*, vol. XIX, p. 78.

7 *IHQ.*, vol. XIII, pp. 482-87.

8 *EL.*, vol. IV, p. 256 and *Ibid.*, vol. VII, p. 44.

9 First edited by Vidyasagar next by Atreya & Godbole from Poona.

10 "न जाने कः पुनरथ श्रीयुवराजपरिषदादेशः" । ".....तन्मन्ये तदभिनये श्रीयुवराज
देवस्य परिषदादेशः ।" *Viddhaśālībhaṇjikā*, pp. 5, 8.

patron, but reference to the head of the Karaculi¹¹ (Kalacuri) whom it calls a monarch, militates against it. It also proves that Yuvarājadeva was the Kalacuri Yuvarājadeva I, in whose court the drama was staged to celebrate his victory over a confederacy of southern kings led by some Vallabha.¹² The reference to 'Karpūvaraṣa',¹³ which is nothing but a derivation from 'Keyūravarṣa',¹⁴ an epithet of king Yuvarājadeva I, clearly proves that the Yuvarājadeva referred to was the Kalacuri prince, the second son of Mugdhatuṅga who came to power after his elder brother Bālaharṣa.

In face of these evidences the question arises how Rājāśekhara went to the Kalacuri court? But when a side glance is thrown on Billhaṇa who migrated from Kashmir and reached the Cālukya court then, it appears most likely that occasionally Rājāśekhara might have visited the Kalacuri court. Now if Bhoja is identified with Bhoja II then Yuvarājadeva I who was the 4th in lineal descent from Kokkala I, certainly cannot be a contemporary of either Mahendrapāla or Mahipāla. Consequently Rājāśekhara could not have visited the court of any Kalacuri Yuvarājadeva. On the other hand if the 'Śrīnidhūḥ'—which cannot be an adjective of Bhoja II whose reign was most uneventful—'Bhojadevaḥ' is taken to be the Mihira Bhoja then the solution of the above discrepancies can be illustrated by the following genealogical tables:—

Pratibhāra
Bhoja I
|
Mahendrapāla
|
Bhoja II
|
Mahipāla

Kalacuri
Kokkala I
|
Mugdhatuṅga
|
Bālaharṣa
|
Yuvarājadeva I¹⁵

The history of the period, during which Bhoja I ruled, also brings to light that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa II displayed great courage and heroism against the roaring Gurjaras in a sanguinary war.¹⁶ The Bagumra plates

11 "करचुलितिलकस्य पार्थिवस्य" । क्षीराम्भोधेरुदधिः करचुलितिलको वर्त्तते चक्रवर्ती ।

Ibid., pp. 129-30.

12 कर्णाटो...नरपतयः संश्रिताः सङ्घवृत्तिम् । प्रेयान्मे...वल्लभो मे विपक्षः । *Ibid.*, p. 131.

13 देवं कर्पूरवर्षं विनयित शिराः । *Ibid.*, p. 128.

14 *El.*, vol. I, p. 257.

15 One collateral succession is common to both. 16 *Id.*, vol. XIII, p. 60.

inform us that Dhurva II alone "easily put to flight the very strong army of the Gurjaras that was eager (for the fray) and reinforced by his kinsman."¹⁷ According to Dr. Tripathi¹⁸ in all likelihood Dhurva II was assisted by his Mānyakheta kinsman and overlord. In the above circumstances it is quite possible that Kokkala I, who was a near relation, either might have helped the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in their Āryāvarta campaign or mediated between the two contestants and thus delivered Bhoja I from fear.

To these may be added Dr. Mazumdar's identification¹⁹ of 'Śaṅkara-gaṇa rājā' with the Kalacuri prince of the same name whose existence is proved by the Kallia grant.²⁰ According to Keilhorn 'the founder of this new branch of the Kalacuris...cannot be placed later than the beginning of the 9th century A.D.' In my opinion that is the latest possible date of the commencement of the Kallia family. In all likelihood it began much earlier because the known date of the 13th king Sodhadeva is 1031 A.D. As Śaṅkaragaṇa was the 3rd in lineal descent so his accession cannot be placed later than c. 840 A.D.

The only controversial point left now is the 'Śrī Harṣa, Citrakūṭa-bhūpāla', whom we can easily identify with the Guhila Harṣa, who was not only a contemporary of Mihira Bhoja but won a few battles for him. This view is further supported by the silence of the Anoda plates about the Candellas. On the contrary Citrakūṭa is often used as a synonym for the modern Chittor in literature and epigraphic records.²¹ Therefore the term 'Śrī Harṣa Citrakūṭabhūpāla' either taken as a whole or separately should not disprove the above identification.

Thus it is quite evident that Kokkala I who was a contemporary of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa II (878-912 A.D.) and the Pratihāra Bhoja I (836-885), ruled between c. 840 and 885 A.D.

KHUSHAL CHANDRA VATSALYA JAIN

17 *Ibid.*, vol. XII, pp. 184-9.

19 *IL.*, p. 53 fn. 1, p. 8, fn. 2.

21 *Vividha Tirtha Kalpa* p. 89, *Prabandha Kośa* p. 24 ff.

18 *History of Kanauja*, p. 243.

20 *El.*, vol. VII, pp. 85-93.

The Sūtrasamuccaya¹

This work still remains a book of doubtful authorship, some attributing to Śāntideva (7th century A.D.), the author of the noted works, *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, others to Nāgārjuna, the famous exponent of the Mādhyamika school of philosophy. Its Sanskrit original is lost but it is preserved in the Tibetan translation,² in 26 sections, covering about 79 folios. It opens with the usual salutation to the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, and the invocation that the appearance of the Buddha in this world is an extremely rare event. Each and every statement that the author has made in this text has been corroborated by appropriate quotations from other works. The titles of works from which quotations appear in the text are as follows:—

Tibetan titles	Sanskrit titles
དམ་པ་འི་ཚེས་པ་དྲ་དཀར་པོ་འི་མཛོད་།	सद्धर्मपुण्डरीकसूत्र ।
གྲུལ་པོ་འི་མཛོད་།	राजसूत्र । (?)*
བྱང་ཆུབ་སེམས་དཔའི་སྒྲིལ་སྒྲོལ་།	बोधिसत्त्वपिटक ।
བཅོམ་ཐུན་འདས་ཀྱི་ཡེ་ཤེས་ཤེན་ཏུ་ གྲུལ་པའི་མཛོད་།	भगवज्ज्ञानवैपुल्यसूत्र ।
ཆེ་བའི་སྒྲིང་པོ་འི་ལའུ་།	चन्द्रगर्भपरिवर्त ।
འཕགས་པ་ཟ་མ་དོག་བཀོད་པའི་མཛོད་།	आर्थकारणडव्यूह ।
བསྐལ་པ་བཟང་པོ་འི་མཛོད་།	भद्रकल्पिकसूत्र ।
ཡང་དག་པར་ཐུན་པའི་ལུང་།	संयुक्तागम ।
དེ་ཅིད་།	तत्त्व । (?)

* Queries (?) indicate that the Sanskrit titles are restored by me.

1 The Tibetan title is མཛོད་གྲུལ་པའི་མཛོད་པ་།

2 *Tanjur, MDO.*, vol. a, folios 165b-244a of the *Snarthang* edition.

Tibetan titles	Sanskrit titles
དེ་བཞིན་གཤེགས་པའི་གསང་བའི་མདོ།	तथागतगुह्यसूत्र ।
དག་པར་འཛེམས་པའི་མདོ།	सुध्वंससूत्र । (?)
དད་པའི་སྟོབས་བསྐྱེད་པའི་མདོ།	श्रद्धाबलाधानसूत्र ।
ཁྱའི་ཀྱལ་པོ་ཀྱ་མཚོས་ཞུས་པ།	सागरनागराजपरिपृच्छा ।
དེ་བཞིན་གཤེགས་པའི་ཡོན་ཏན་ དང་ ཡེ་ཤེས་བསམ་གྱིས་མི་བྱབ་པ་མི་ ཡུལ་ལ་འཇུག་པ་བསྟན་པའི་མདོ།	तथागतगुणज्ञानचिन्त्यविषयावतार- निर्देशसूत्र ।
རབ་རྩ་ཞི་བ་རྣམ་པར་ངེས་པའི་ཚེ་འབྲུལ་ གྱི་མདོ།	प्रशान्तविनिश्चयप्रातिहार्यसूत्र ।
འཕགས་པ་མ་སྐྱིས་དགའི་ལེའུ།	आर्याजातशत्रुपरिवर्त ।
རིན་པོ་ཆེ་པར་བའི་མདོ།	रत्नराशिसूत्र ।
འོད་སྤངས་ཀྱི་ལེའུ།	काश्यपपरिवर्त ।
ཡབ་སྲས་མཇལ་བའི་མདོ།	पितापुत्रसमागमसूत्र ।
ཆོས་ཡང་དག་པར་སྤྱད་པའི་མདོ།	धर्मसंगीतिसूत्र ।
འཕགས་པ་བ་སྐོ་གྲོས་མི་ཟད་པས་བསྟན་ པའི་མདོ།	आर्याक्षयमतिदेशनासूत्र ।
ཐབས་ལ་མཁས་པའི་མདོ།	उपायकौशल्यसूत्र ।
བྱིས་བདག་དཔས་བྱིན་གྱིས་ཞུས་པ།	वीरदत्तगृहपतिपरिपृच्छा ।
འཕགས་པ་དཀོན་མཆོག་སྤྱིན་གྱི་མདོ།	आर्यरत्नमेघसूत्र ।
འཕགས་པ་བྱམས་པའི་སང་གའི་སྐུའི་མདོ།	आर्यमैत्रेयसिंहनादसूत्र ।

Tibetan titles

Sanskrit titles

འཕགས་པ་འཇམ་དབལ་རྣམ་པར་

རོལ་པའི་མདོ།

आर्यमञ्जुश्रीविक्रान्तिसूत्र ।

འཕགས་པ་རྒྱ་བ་སྒྲིན་མའི་མདོ།

आर्यचन्द्रप्रदीपसूत्र ।

ངེས་པ་དང་མ་ངེས་པར་འཇུག་པའི་

ཐུག་ཀྱི་མདོ།

नियतानियतमुद्रावतारसूत्र ।

ཤེས་རབ་ཀྱི་པ་རོལ་དུ་སྒྱེན་པ།

प्रज्ञापारमिता ।

བྱང་ཆུབ་སེམས་དཔའ་རྣམས་ཀྱི་བདུན་

ཀྱི་ལས་ནི་ཤེས་རབ་ཀྱི་པ་རོལ་དུ་

སྒྱེན་པ།

बोधिमत्त्वमारकर्मप्रज्ञापारमिता ।(१)

སྒྲོ་གྲེས་ཀྱ་མཆོས་ཞུས་པའི་མདོ།

सागरमतिपरिपृच्छासूत्र ।

རབ་དུ་འབྱུང་བའི་བར་དུ་གཅོད་པའི་མདོ།

प्रव्रज्यान्तरायसूत्र । (१)

བད་ས་ལའི་རྒྱལ་པོ་ཤར་བས་ཞུས་པའི་མདོ།

उदयनवत्सराजपरिपृच्छा ।

གསལ་རྒྱལ་གྱིས་ཞུས་པའི་མདོ།

प्रसेनजित्परिपृच्छासूत्र ।

དབལ་བྱིན་གྱིས་ཞུས་པའི་མདོ།

वीरदत्तपरिपृच्छासूत्र ।

འཕགས་པ་རྩི་མ་མེད་པར་གྲགས་

आर्यविमलकीर्तिनिर्देश ।

བས་བསྟན་པ།

བདེན་པ་པོའི་ལུ།

सत्यकपरिवर्त । (१)

ཡིད་གཉིས་ལ་ལེགས་པར་འཇོམས་

པའི་མདོ།

विचिकित्सासुखंསसूत्र । (१)

ཉི་མའི་སྒྲིང་པོའི་ལུ།

सूर्यगर्भपरिवर्त ।

Tibetan titles

ནས་ཁའི་སྡིང་པོའི་ལེའུ །
 འཕགས་པ་སའི་སྡིང་པོའི་མདོ །
 འཕགས་པ་ཆེ་འོད་ཀྱི་ལེའུ །
 ལྷག་པའི་བསམ་པ་སྐལ་པའི་མདོ །
 དམ་པའི་ཆོས་རྩེ་པ་ཉི་པར་གཞག་
 པའི་མདོ །
 འཕགས་པ་ཚངས་པས་ཞུས་པའི་མདོ །
 མེ་དོག་བརྟེན་པས་པའི་མདོ །
 སྡིང་རྩེ་ཆེན་པོའི་མདོ །
 དེ་བཞིན་གཤེགས་པའི་གཟུགས་ཀྱི་ལེའུ །
 མཐར་གྱིས་ཡང་དག་པར་འཕགས་པའི་མདོ །
 བྱས་པ་སེང་གའི་སྐྱའི་མདོ །
 འཇིག་རྟེན་ལས་འདས་པའི་ལེའུ །
 ཡང་ཀར་གཤེགས་པའི་མདོ །
 འདུས་པ་ཆེན་པོའི་ལེའུ །
 འཕགས་པ་གཟུངས་ཀྱི་དབང་ཕྱག་
 སྐལ་པོས་ཞུས་པའི་མདོ །
 སྤྱིར་སྤྲོ་བ་པའི་འཁོར་ལོའི་མདོ །
 འཕགས་པ་དཔལ་གྱི་སྤང་བ་སེང་
 གའི་སྐྱའི་མདོ །

Sanskrit titles

आकाशगर्भपरिवर्त ।
 आर्यक्षितिगर्भसूत्र ।
 आर्यचन्द्रप्रभपरिवर्त ।
 अध्याशयमंचोदनसूत्र ।
 सद्धर्मस्मृत्युपस्थानसूत्र ।
 आर्यब्रह्मपरिपृच्छासूत्र ।
 पुष्पकूटसूत्र ।
 महाकरुणासूत्र ।
 तथागतबिम्बपरिवर्त ।
 आर्यक्रमविशुद्धसूत्र । (?)
 (lit. क्रमविशुद्धार्थसूत्र)
 मैत्रेयसिंहनादसूत्र ।
 लोकोत्तरपरिवर्त ।
 लङ्कावतारसूत्र ।
 महासमयपरिवर्त
 आर्यधारणोराजेश्वरपरिपृच्छासूत्र ।
 अवैवर्तचक्रसूत्र ।
 आर्यश्रीमालासिंहनादसूत्र ।

Tibetan titles	Sanskrit titles
མདོ་དེ་ཉིད་ཀྱི་སྡོན་གྱི་ཚུལ་གྱི་ལེའ །	सूत्रतत्त्वादिशोलपग्विर्त । (?)
སྐུ་མ་མཁན་བཟང་པོ་འི་འདོ །	भद्रमायाकरसूत्र ।
ཚངས་པ་བྱད་པར་སེམས་ཀྱིས་ ཉུས་ པའི་མདོ །	ब्रह्मविशेषचित्तिपरिपृच्छासूत्र ।
རིན་པོ་ཆེ་བསགས་པ་བསྟན་པའི་མདོ །	रत्नसमुच्चयदेशनासूत्र ।
ཆེ་བ་སྟོན་མའི་མདོའི་ཚོགས་བཅད་པ །	चन्द्रप्रदीपसूत्रगाथा ।
བྱེད་རིན་པོ་ཆེས་བྱིན་པའི་མདོ །	दारकरत्नदानसूत्र । (?)
དེ་བཞིན་གཤེགས་པའི་མཛོད་ཀྱི་མདོ །	तथागतकोपसूत्र । (?)
བདུད་འདུལ་བའི་མདོ །	मारविनयसूत्र । (?)
བྱང་ཆུབ་སེམས་དཔལ་ཀྱན་ཏེ་བཟང་པོ །	बोधिसत्त्वसमन्तभद्र । (?)
བྱང་ཆུབ་སེམས་དཔལ་ཆེ་བོ་ ཉིད་ཀྱི་ ཆེན་པོ་མདོ །	बोधिसत्त्वविस्तीर्णमाहात्म्यसूत्र । (?)
འབགས་པ་སངས་རྒྱས་པལ་པོ་ཆའི་མདོ །	आर्यबुद्धावतंसकसूत्र ।
དད་པའི་སྟོབས་སྦྱིད་པ་ལ་འཇུག་པའི་ ཕྱག་རྒྱའི་མདོ །	श्रद्धाबलाधानावतारसुद्रासूत्र ।

Though this work appears to be a prototype of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, it seems to be a composition of Nāgārjuna. In the Tibetan translation³ its authorship is ascribed to Nāgārjuna, and the title given is *Sūtrasamuccaya-mahāyānaratnaparikathā*.⁴ Judging from its contents, we mean its highly

3 P. Cordier, *Catalogue*, pt. II, p. 323; *MDO.*, XXX, 29.

4 མདོ་སྟོན་སྡོན་ཚོགས་ལས་བདས་པ ། ཐེག་པ་ཆེན་པོ་རིན་པོ་ཆའི་གདམ །
ཨ་རུ་ཏུ་ཏུ་གྲུ་ནས་མཛོད་པ་རྫོགས །
འཇུག་པའི་མདོ

philosophical discussions and occasional references to the doctrine of Śūnyatā, the presumption goes in favour of the authorship of Nāgārjuna.⁵ Our strongest ground for upholding this view is that in the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*⁶ Śāntideva in recommending the detailed study of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* says:—

शिक्षासमुच्चयोऽवश्यं द्रष्टव्यश्च पुनः पुनः ।

विस्तरेण सदाचारो यस्मात्तत्र प्रदर्शितः ॥

संक्षेपेणाथ वा तावत्पश्येत् सूत्रसमुच्चयम् ।

आर्यनागार्जुनाबद्धं द्वितीयं च प्रयत्नतः ॥

[*Śikṣāsamuccaya* should be consulted again and again, wherein are detailed the rules of conduct. *Sūtrasamuccaya* is a concise statement of the same but the second work of this name by Ārya Nāgārjuna should be studied with great care].

Prajñākaramati, the commentator of the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, explains that the word *dviṭīya* mentioned in the verse cited above refers to two texts, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the *Sūtrasamuccaya* of Nāgārjuna. In other words, he ascribes the authorship of both the texts to Nāgārjuna. There is no evidence to show that Nāgārjuna was the author of *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. Prof. Louis de la Vallée Poussin says that the word *dviṭīya* refers to *Sūtrasamuccaya*. Tāranātha ascribes the three works *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, *Sūtrasamuccaya* and *Bodhicaryāvatāra* to Śāntideva.⁷ The biography of Śāntideva which Mm. Prof. Haraprasad Śāstrī found in a Nepalese manuscript corroborates the statement of Tāranātha. It also speaks of the three works of Śāntideva⁸ but in the *History of Buddhism* by Bu-ston translated from Tibetan into English" by Dr. E. Obermiller we find that *Sūtrasamuccaya* is included in the list of both the teachers, Nāgārjuna as well as Śāntideva. Bu-ston mentions that *Sūtrasamuccaya* of Śāntideva is very abridged.

From these evidences, it is clear that there were two texts of *Sūtrasamuccaya*—one by Śāntideva and the other by Nāgārjuna, and that Śāntideva regarded the work of Nāgārjuna as of great importance and recommended its more careful study than that of his own.

ANUKULCHANDRA BANERJEE

5 Cf. Tib. text, sections 25 ff.

6 *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, V, 105f.

7 Schiefner, *Geschichte des Buddhismus*, pp. 162 ff.; cf. also C. Bendall, *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, Introd., pp. iv, ff.

8 *Ind. Ant.*, 1913, pp. 49-52.

9 Pt. II, pp. 125, 163.

The Fourth Session of the Indian History Congress, Lahore, 1940

The fourth Session of the Congress was held at the historic city of Lahore on the 16th, 17th and 18th December, 1940. A large number of delegates representing almost all Indian Universities and several learned bodies, as well as the Archaeological Departments of the Government of India and the Indian States, attended the Session. Most of the delegates were accommodated in the University premises up till the morning of the 18th December; but those who had to stay on for the proposed excursion had to make their own arrangements.

On Monday, the 16th December, at 10-30 A.M., the Session of the Indian History Congress was opened by the Hon'ble Mr. Manohar Lal. Dewan Bahadur Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar of Madras was elected the General President of the Session. After the learned address delivered by the President, the proceedings of the Calcutta Session were formally presented to the Congress by Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri of the Calcutta University. The sectional meetings then commenced with the undermentioned scholars in the chair:

Section I (Archaeology)—Mr. Ghulam Yazdani, Director of Archaeology, Hyderabad State.

Section II (Early India)—Dr. R. K. Mukerji, Professor of History, Lucknow University.

Section III (Medieval India)—Khan Bahadur Maulvi Zafar Hasan, Superintendent, Archaeological Survey of India, Northern Circle, Agra.

Section IV (Mughal India)—Prof. M. Habib, Aligarh University.

Section V (Modern India)—Dr. S. N. Sen, Keeper of Records, Government of India, New Delhi.

Section VI (Sikh History)—Sir Jogindar Singh.

The addresses delivered by the sectional presidents were all learned and interesting. Mr. Yazdani's address was divided into two parts, the first part making a vigorous defence of the Archaeological Department of the India Government against the criticisms of Sir Leonard Woolley, and the second describing the achievements of the Archaeological Department of His Exalted Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad. The delegates present

appreciated the learned addresses, but they were disappointed in not having a general review of the year's contributions to their respective spheres.

About eighty papers were contributed to the different sections of the Congress; but a large number of them had to be taken as read, as the writers did not attend the Session. The local Reception Committee prepared and printed a list of the papers, received before the beginning of December, for the use of the delegates. This was however against Resolution No. 6 passed by the Calcutta Session of the Congress (vide *Proceedings of the Third Session, 1939*, p. xxiv) and was considered inconvenient by those who wanted to take part in the discussions. From a mere list of the titles of papers one could hardly know whether any paper contained any original contribution, or whether one's own views were going to be criticised. This inconvenience was specially felt when the different sections held their meetings at the same time and at places apart. To avoid such difficulties, the sectional meetings could be held one after another or at least in contiguous rooms and the summaries of at least the more important papers should have been published for the use of the delegates.

In Section I (Archaeology), interesting papers were read by Messers. J. N. Banerjee, P. Acharya and Jagannath, and lively discussions followed on the papers "Many-headed, many-limbed gods" by Dr. C. L. Fabri and "Mithuna on some early Indian coins" by Mr. R. C. Kar. In the paper entitled "Some Early Rājāsāsanas", it was suggested that some of the Nasik cave inscriptions were copies of genuine royal charters of the Kṣaharāta and Sātavāhana rulers, and that, during the process of copying, some of them were distorted and in a few cases more than one charter were presented as a single record.

In Section II (Early India), Prof. V. V. Mirashi, Mr. Gulsan Rai, Dr. A. S. Altekar, Mr. S. Banerji, Dr. M. Rama Rao, Mr. K. R. Chatterji, Mr. G. S. Das and Mr. K. C. Chattopadhyaya read interesting papers. In his learned paper, Prof. Mirashi supported the suggestions (cf. *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 182 ff.) that Pravarasena of the Vatsagulma grant is to be identified with Pravarasena I Vākātaka and that Vindhyaśakti (II) of the record should be taken as the great-grandson of Vindhyaśakti (I), founder of the Vākātaka dynasty. He also suggested the emendations सर्वसेन and विन्ध्यसेन (=विन्ध्यशक्ति II) respectively for the conjectural readings रुद्रसेन and पृथिवीषेण in the Ajantā inscription which he ascribed to the Vatsagulma branch of the

Vākāṭaka dynasty. Of outstanding interest was Prof. Altekar's announcement regarding the discovery of a grant of Viṣṇugupta, suggested to be a Later Gupta king of that name. The date portion of the record reads *सम्बत्सरे सप्तदशे, सम्बत् १०+७*. At the President's suggestion, the learned professor agreed to write a paper on this record for the proceedings of the session. Dr. Lakshman Sarup's paper was on a passage mentioning a Vikramāditya of the 7th century A.D., belonging to the Malwa region. He was inclined to emend the text and to identify the king with Yaśodharma of Mandasor (second quarter of the sixth century A.D.), on the ground that there could have been no paramount sovereign in Malwa during the life time of Harṣa-vardhana (606-47 A.D.). Dr. R. C. Majumdar however pointed out that there was no evidence to prove the inclusion of Malwa within the empire of Harṣa and to establish that Yaśodharman ever assumed the title of Vikramāditya. Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri considered unnecessary emendation of texts as unscientific; he also pointed out that the title Vikramāditya was assumed not only by paramount sovereigns but sometimes also by feudatories like the Bāṇas, and that there is no improbability in the existence of a Vikramāditya in Malwa at the time of Harṣa.

The business of Sections III (Medieval India), IV (Mughal India), V (Modern India) and VI (Sikh History) was also successfully conducted by the learned presidents, and many papers were read in those sections. There was a number of important papers written by scholars representing the local institutions. Among the notable papers there were those of Prof. H. K. Sherwani, Pandit B. N. Reu, Prof. C. S. Srinivasachari, Mr. S. N. Banerjee, Mr. S. Bhattacharya, Mr. N. C. Sinha and others. In the Modern India Section, Mr. S. N. Banerjee ably conducted the President's business for some time, when Dr. S. N. Sen, the Sectional President, was absent.

The concluding meeting of the Session was held in the Senate Room (Hailey Hall) on Wednesday, the 18th December, at 2 p.m. The resolution regarding that election of office-bearers and members of the Executive Committee was moved from the Chair and passed. This course disappointed some of the delegates who expected that the Committee members and office-bearers would be elected by delegates who attended at least three sessions of the Congress and that those members and office-bearers who had already served for three annual terms should not be elected for the next three terms.

After the election of the office-bearers, Prof. H. K. Sherwani invited the Indian History Congress on behalf of the Osmania University to hold its next Session at the capital of His Exalted Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad. The invitation was accepted with thanks. Thanks to the local workers and the Reception Committee—whose ungrudging labour was responsible for the success of the Session—were then offered by Dr. R. C. Majumdar and Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri, and the Fourth Session of the Congress closed with the concluding speech of the President.

A notable feature of the Session was a Historical Exhibition arranged in the Mayo School of Arts. It was opened by the Hon'ble Chief Justice of the Lahore High Court. The paintings of the Junior Roerich and some rare MSS were the chief exhibits of attraction.

The Numismatic Society of India held its annual meeting at Lahore (at the University Chemistry Lecture Theatre) along with the Session of the Indian History Congress on the 17th and 18th December. On the first day, the learned address of the President of the Society was read in the meeting.

A varied programme of entertainment arranged by the Reception Committee consisted of a garden party given by the Punjab University Historical Society on the University lawn; Indian concert in the University Hall organised by the University Music Department; evening party in the Meynard Hall given by the Hon'ble Mr. C. P. Skrine, the Resident, who showed a coloured film entitled "This India", which was much enjoyed by the delegates; tea at the Lahore Fort given by the organisers of the Session; dinner given by the Reception Committee in the Montgomery Hall, Lawrence Gardens, at which His Excellency the Governor of the Punjab was present; and lunch given by the organisers of the Session at the Standard Restaurant, the Mall. One of the notable functions was a garden party in the Government House where His Excellency honoured the delegates by his presence. Local excursions to Shalimar Bag, Lahore Fort and Shah Dara were enjoyed by the delegates. Those who were willing to visit Harappa and Taxila had to make arrangements for themselves.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

REVIEWS

SOME ASPECTS OF ANCIENT INDIAN CULTURE by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, M.A., (Hony.) PH.D., F.R.A.S.B., etc., etc.

This is a collection of six lectures delivered by Dr. Bhandarkar at the University of Madras. The lectures belong to the series called "Sir William Meyer Lectures". In these lectures Dr. Bhandarkar discusses various problems of ancient Indian culture particularly of the Vedic period. The problems are well defined and the treatment is as comprehensive as possible within the limited scope.

Dr. Bhandarkar first of all deals with the problem of the Ārya, Dāsa and Śūdra. He next determines the special character of the Aryan culture, and then deals with the question of Aryanisation of India at length. Last of all the questions of Brahmanisation and Indianisation have also been treated at some length. Ārya, according to Dr. Bhandarkar, is a racial term. The Dāsas or Dasyus were originally the Dahae of the Caspienne steppes, some of whom seem to have embraced the Aryan religion. But Dr. Bhandarkar also points out that in course of time the word Dāsa had lost its ethnological significance and denoted any foreigners who did not conform to the Aryan practices. The word Śūdra was a tribal name even up to the time of Patañjali. So far as the special character of the Aryan culture is concerned, Dr. Bhandarkar is of opinion that the most important characteristic was *varṇāśrama*, although *varṇa* meant only class in the early period. In regard to the place of the Upanisadic philosophy and Vedic sacerdotalism in the Aryan culture he is of opinion that "if the former appealed to the microscopic minority, the latter must surely have appealed to the macrocosmic majority, of the foreigners and barbarians with whom the Aryans came into contact in India" (p. 25).

In Lectures III and IV Dr. Bhandarkar deals with the problem of Aryanisation of India. He believes that there was an Asura civilisation specially confined to Eastern India which the Aryans supplanted after conquering the Asuras. He has quoted a number of verses from the Vedic texts in which this Asura defeat is indicated. He also believes with many other scholars that the *Atharvaveda* is a repository of non-Aryan culture

which consists of two elements: Asura and Chaldaean. But he says "How many of them were Chaldaean and how many non-Aryan it is difficult to say." He also deals with the problems of the Vrātyas and Vṛṣalas and is of opinion that they represented the non-Aryan element. He believes that the Vrātya cult developed into Śaivism and that it was first introduced in the Indus Valley by the Māgadhas, emigrants from Śākadvīpa who later on went over to the country subsequently known as Magadha. Dr. Bhandarkar next deals with the question of Brahmanisation of the Indian society and points out that conversion was known in Brahmanism in ancient times. The last lecture deals with the problem of Indianisation of foreign cultures.

It must be admitted that the lectures are well planned and that Dr. Bhandarkar deals with the problems with his usual care and thoroughness. Thought-provoking suggestions have been frequently made. But as we are generally used to accept suggestions as established facts we wish some of the suggestions had not been made at all. In regard to the Vedic period so many uncritical theories have been put forward by European and Indian scholars that all serious scholars should refrain from adding to the number of such theories already current. Identifications of Paṇi with Parnian, Dāsa with Dahae, Parśu with Persian etc. are not accepted by many Vedic scholars. Prof. Bhandarkar's identification of Keśin with Kassu or Kassites is equally unacceptable. So far as the Chaldaean element in the *Atharvaveda* is concerned, Tilak's theory is based on certain similarities in the names of divinities. But nothing has been proved by him. To believe that Śaivism was originally a Vrātya cult and that Magadha was colonised by Magi emigrants is to believe in old superstitions.

Although Dr. Bhandarkar has introduced in his lectures a number of theories that have been either discarded or proved untenable, still his lectures are useful for the new materials collected by him and for the freshness in the discussion.

P. C. BAGCHI

SOURCES OF KARNĀṬAKA HISTORY, vol. I, by S. Srikantha Sastri, M.A.; published by the University of Mysore, 1940; pages xlvii + 238.

In the book under review, the learned author has collected and arranged in an approximately chronological order passages relating to the history of the Karnāṭa region from inscriptions and works in Kanarese, Telugu, Tamil, Sanskrit and Marathi. There are also a few passages from translations of works in Greek (the *Periplus*, Ptolemy's *Geography*, the farce in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, no. 4137), Chinese (Yuan Chwang's *Si-yü-ki*) and Persian (*Tabarī*). The extracts in the volume under notice refer to the Śātakarṇis and Kadambas of Kuntala, the Cālukyās of Bādāmi and Kalyāṇī, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mālkheḍ, the Kalacuryas of Kalyāṇī and the Yādavas of Devagiri. The author proposes to deal with the sources of the history of the Hoysaḷas and the kings of Vijayanagara in a separate volume. His short introduction deals with such interesting topics relating to Karnāṭaka as its geography, political history, arts and literature, religious, social and economic conditions and Karnāṭaka culture. The volume contains no less than twenty genealogical tables.

Mr. Srikantha Sastri has worked hard in compiling this book, and his plan is praiseworthy. Such source books will be welcomed by the students of history. The work under notice however suffers from some defects which, we are afraid, would hamper its usefulness considerably. Firstly, the author has omitted a large number of important records such as (1) the Haḷṣi grant of Kākusthavarman, the only early Kadamba inscription bearing a year of some era; (2) Harivarman's Sangoli grant dated in 526 A.D. or 545 A.D.; (3) Devavarman's Devagiri grant referring to Kṛṣṇavarman I as a performer of Aśvamedha; (4) any inscription (Radhanpur, Sanjan or any other) of mighty Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings like Govinda III and Amoghavarṣa I; and so forth. Secondly, a large number of mistakes and misprints (in some cases old readings which have later been given up by scholars) has crept in the extracts quoted from inscriptions and also in the author's notes, and students would necessarily hesitate to rely on the book under review. 'Sātāhanihāra' (p. ix) for 'Sātāhanirāṭṭha or Sātavāhanihāra'; "Śrīvallabha, son of Indrarāja" (p. xv) for "Śrīvallabha, son of Kṛṣṇa"; "in the year 102" (p. 11) for "in the year 12"; विण्डुकड्डुड (p. 41) for विण्डुकड्डुड; मट्टपट्टिवो (p. 16) for Malapalidevo; निजं तमुच राज्यजीवितं चोष्णतस्म

(p. 40) for निजमतनु च राज्यजीवितञ्चोत्कृतिस्म; येन चाकारि हर्षः (p. 41) for येन चाकारि हर्षः; ग्रामभाजं (p. 41) for ग्रामभाजां etc., are only a few of the numerous instances. Thirdly there are many statements in the author's introduction and notes which appear to be opposed to evidence. According to the author Kṛṣṇavarman II performed an Aśvamedha (p. ix) and was defeated by Ravi-varman (p. x). The suggestions are not justifiable. Cf. Sircar, *Successors of the Śātavāhanas*, Calcutta, 1939, pp. 272, 299ff. The author refers to the Kôramaṅgā (? Davangere) grant as recording gifts of land "in Vêṭikāṭa" (p. 24). The lands were actually granted at Kôramaṅgā, Asandī and Vêṭikauṭa (Sircar, *op. cit.* p. 403). The Halmiḍi (Palmiḍi) inscription (pp. 20-21) appears to belong to the Bhaṭṭāri rather than to the Kadamba family, and Mrgeśa of this record may be a Bhaṭṭāri who possibly figures in the Haḷṣi grant of Harivarman (Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 276). There are many other points like the above in different parts of the book, on which we cannot agree with the author.

In spite of such defects the book under review may be recommended to all students of South Indian history for the vast wealth of materials collected by Mr. Sastri. We earnestly hope that the learned author will try to avoid such mistakes in the second volume of his book and in the second edition of the work under notice.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

WARREN HASTINGS AND OUDH by C. Collin Davies, M.A., PH.D. Oxford University Press. London 1939.

This is a monograph on Warren Hastings' relations with Oudh and is based on original manuscript sources at the India Office Library and the British Museum. The book "opens with a discussion of Hastings' diplomatic inheritance and then proceeds to describe his efforts at strengthening by means of a subsidiary alliance the British connection with the important buffer state of Oudh". This involves consideration of such controversial transactions as the Rohilla War, the episode of Chait Singh, and the spoliation of the Begums of Oudh. The author has bestowed a great deal of care and labour on the book and has brought to light much valuable material. He has made an important contribution to the study of the period and every student of British Indian history should be grateful to him.

Warren Hastings' foreign policy, particularly his dealings with Oudh and the adjoining States, has evoked severe criticism on the one hand and unstinted praise on the other. Critics in the past have often been misinformed and the violence of their language has defeated its own purpose. In the present day the pendulum has swung in the opposite direction and the tendency now is to shower offerings at his shrine. One can be an admirer of Hastings without upholding every action of his. For there was much in his actions that cannot be justified. It is precisely in this respect that Dr. Davies has belied our expectations to some extent. His defence of the Rohilla War is not convincing. Was there really any justification for an attack on a people who had given no cause of quarrel to the British?

As regards Chait Singh, Dr. Davies is at pains to prove that he was an ordinary zemindar. But no ordinary zemindar possessed the right of minting coins, which was the exclusive privilege of the Emperor or the independent Nawabs. Even assuming that the East India Company had a perfect right to impose additional revenue in times of war, was it proper to levy 5 lakhs per annum over and above 22 lakhs that were ordinarily payable? And what is one to say about Hastings' conduct in receiving a bribe of 2 lakhs (it was offered as a bribe and Hastings knew it, though he paid it into the Treasury later on) and then reiterating a demand for 5 lakhs? To crown all came the fine of 50 lakhs imposed for non-payment of the demand. The fact is that Hastings' personal animosity towards Chait Singh made him behave outrageously towards the Raja and drove him to rebellion. After the Raja's flight, he raised the revenue demands on Benares from 22 lakhs to 40 lakhs per annum. It was not Mir Qasim alone who was guilty of ruining a fair province by exorbitant increase in the revenues.

With regard to the Begums of Oudh, Dr. Davies is in some difficulties in defending Hastings' actions, in view of the guarantee given by the British to the Bahu Begum in 1775. So he condemns the guarantee itself and states that it was "a fundamental error" to have given that guarantee for "it pledged the Company to protect her against the future demands of her lawful sovereign." It is immaterial to discuss whether the guarantee should have been given or not; we have merely to consider Hastings' conduct, who in utter violation of the solemn pledge given by the Company was instrumental in plundering the treasures and resuming the jagirs of the

Begums. Dr. Davies says that Hastings was convinced of the Begums' treachery during Chait Singh's rebellion. The evidence for this statement is extremely meagre and not at all reliable. The author says "If however it were possible to disprove the complicity of the Begums in the insurrection of 1781, then Hastings' conduct would be open to blame". It is a fundamental principle of English law that a negative cannot be proved; the onus is on the party who makes a positive statement. Far better evidence must be adduced before the guilt of the Begums will be proved. Dr. Davies however thinks that Hastings should not have taken the active part that he did in this matter.

"To cancel the guarantee and leave the Nawab to his own devices was one thing, to spur him on and assist him in measures of coercion was an entirely different matter. It is here that Hastings and Middleton lose caste."

He roundly condemns the methods that were employed to extort the treasure from the eunuchs.

Hastings undoubtedly was a unique personality. At a time when the British were beset with many dangers and were losing a colony in one part of the world, he, with courage, steadiness and foresight and in the face of innumerable difficulties, was building an empire in another part of the globe. As an administrator too, he was able and far-sighted in many respects. But he had his faults, and faults of such a glaring nature that they cannot be dismissed as mere blots on a great man.

To say all this is not to disparage Dr. Davies, who has written an excellent book on the foreign policy of Warren Hastings.

S. K. DUTT

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Adyar Library Bulletin, vol. v, pt. 1

- P. K. CODE.—*Date of the Viṣṇubhaktīkalpalatā of Puruṣottama*.—Before A.D. 1495.
- K. N. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR.—*Rājadharmā*. The paper, dealing with the scope and contents of the literature on Dharma that has influenced the social and political life of the Hindus (published previously in the Journal), has been supplemented in this issue with Notes.
- The following serial publications appear in this issue :
- Jīvanāndanam of Ānandarāya Makhin* (Edited).
- Sāmavedasamhitā with Commentaries of Mādhava and Bharatasvāmin* (Edited).
- Sanḡitaratnākara with Commentaries of Catura Kallinātha and Simhabhūpāla* (Edited).
- Nyāyakusumāñjali of Udayanācārya* (Translated into English).
- Pāñcarātraraksā of Vedāntadeśika* (Edited).
- Avyaktopaniṣad* (Translated into English).
- Āśvalāyanagḥyāsūtra with Devasvāmibhāṣya* (Edited).
- Ālambanaparīkṣā* (Translated into English with extracts from Vinīta-deva's Commentary).

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,
vol. XXI, pts. I-II

- A. N. UPADHYE.—*Paiśācī Language and Literature*. In the absence of any ancient Paiśācī text, the conclusions regarding the linguistic traits of this Prakrit dialect have been arrived at from the description of Paiśācī given in various Prakrit grammars. The original home of Paiśācī might have been the north-west of India. But the dialect in the 'mouths of an itinerant tribe' spread far and wide and became, as Rājaśekhara testifies in the 9th century of the Christian era, popular near the Vindhayas. As regards literary works in Paiśācī, the *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇādhyā survives only in its Sanskrit versions. In later times, Jain scholars like Hemacandra gave some impetus to the dying language.

- R. C. HAZRA.—*The Upapurāṇas*. The age of Upapurāṇas begins approximately from the Gupta period and the date of the definite formation of the group of eighteen Upapurāṇas as mentioned in the *Kūrmapurāṇa* is placed approximately between 650 and 800 A.D. As to the origin of this class of works, it is supposed that it was the Smārta adherents to the popular system of religion such as Pāñcarātras, Pāsupatas etc. who took up the Purāṇas for establishing the Varṇāśramadharmā and the authority of the Vedas among the people and increased the number of the already existing Purāṇas by the fresh addition of Purāṇic works—Upapurāṇas.
- G. V. DEVASTHALI.—*On the Probable Date of Jaimini and His Sūtras*. Arguments have been put forward to show that the Buddhistic doctrines were not alluded to in the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*, nor was its author Jaimini familiar with Yāska's *Nirukta*. Hence Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* cannot be later than 500 B.C.
- A. M. GHATAGE.—*Concord in Prakrit Syntax*.
- H. C. SETH.—*Identification of Udayana of Kauśāmbī with Udayin of Magadha*. The writer of the article tries to show that Udayana of Kauśāmbī occupied the throne of the Magadhan kingdom after Darśaka, the son and successor of Ajātaśatru. Thus Udayin of the Purāṇas, Udayabhada of the *Dīpavamsa* and *Mahāvamsa* are identical with Udayana of the well-known literary traditions.
- H. G. NARAHARI.—*The Samādhilakṣaṇa and the Bhagavad-gīta*. The *Samādhilakṣaṇa* forming a part of the *Sūtasamhitā* of the *Skandapurāṇa* is indebted to the *Bhagavad-gītā* for its contents. Like Bhagavān of the *Gītā*, Īśvara here imparts lessons on the yogic Samādhi that brings the highest bliss to mankind. Many verses are obviously imitations of the statements contained in the *Gītā*.
- SUBHADRA JHA.—*Maithili Equivalents to Vernacular Words found in Sarvānanda's Commentary on Amarakośa*.
- ANANT P. KARMAKAR.—*Fresh and Further Light on the Mohenjo-daro Riddle*. Relying on the assertions that the inscriptions of Mohenjo-daro refer to the country of the Mīnas and mention the name of the god Āṇ (Rudra-Śiva), the writer of the paper attempts to give an idea of the Mīna country and her people, and the characteristics of the god

Āṇ from the descriptions and references contained in the Vedic and Purāṇic literature.

- P. K. GODE.—*The Dates of Nārāyaṇa Dikṣita and other Commentators of the Vāsavadattā of Subandhu*. A number of Commentaries on Subandhu's *Vāsavadattā* has been mentioned and, in many cases, their dates discussed. Nārāyaṇa's Commentary which is available in manuscript, has been described and assigned to a date between 1250 and 1550 A.C.

Annals of Oriental Research of the University of Madras, vol. v, pt. 1

- K. RAMAKRISHNAYYA.—*Telugu Literature outside the Telugu Country*.
 C. ACHYUTA MENON.—*Ancient Kerala*. The importance of the culture, tradition, folklore, archæology and literature of ancient Kerala has been discussed.
 T. R. CHINTAMANI.—व्यवहारशिरोमणिः. The *Vyavahāraśiromaṇi*, a short treatise on judicial law, has been edited here. The importance of the work lies in the fact that its author Nārāyaṇa was a pupil of Vijñāneśvara, the author of the famous *Mitākṣarā* composed in the latter part of the 11th century A.C.
 S. MUHAMMAD HUSAYN NAINAR.—*Arabic and Persian Words in the Tamil Language*.
 S. S. SURYANARAYANA SASTRI.—तत्त्वशुद्धिः. Chapters 26-32 of this Advaita manual have been edited in this instalment.

**Annals of the Śrī-Venkaṭeśvara Oriental Institute, Tirupati,
vol. I, pt. iv**

- P. K. GODE.—*Bernier and Kavīndrācārya Sarasvatī at the Mughal Court*. An eminently learned scholar of the 17th century, Kavīndrācārya received recognition and patronage at the hands of Shāh Jahān, Dārā Shikoh, and Danishmand Khān of Delhi. The Khān was also a patron of the French traveller Bernier. This paper gives a connected account of Kavīndra's life as ascertained from the *Kavīndracandrodaya*, a contemporary work, and a letter written by Bernier.
 K. C. VARADACHARI.—*The Psycho-physiology of the Minor Upaniṣads*. The descriptions and functions of the *Nāḍīs* and *Cakras* forming psycho-physiological structures have been dealt with here on the basis of the data found mainly in the minor Upaniṣads.

- P. S. NAIDU.—*A Functional Classification of some Bharata-Nāṭya Poses.* Types of Karaṇas or poses mentioned in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* have been explained. Some of them are simply meant for the pleasure of the eye, others indicate objects, ideas and emotions expressed through some peculiar movements, or signify extraordinary methods of transit; e.g. ascent to and descent from the heaven in *Vimānas*.
- C. V. SANKARA RAO.—*Rāmānuja's Philosophy of Thought and Action.* The essentials of Rāmānuja's Viśiṣṭādvaita system of philosophy have been touched, and their principal differences with Śaṅkara's Advaita doctrines pointed out.
- K. C. VARADACHARI.—*Śrī Vedānta Deśika on the Pracchanna Bauddha School.* The doctrine of Māyā which is regarded here as a Buddhistic conception in disguise has been refuted by Vedānta Deśika in the 11th chapter of his *Paramatabhaṅga* which was written in the early 14th century in support of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school of Vedānta. The present paper is an English translation of the said chapter.
- M. RAMAKRISHNA KAVI.—*Cāṅkṣuṣīya: An Ancient Work on Arthaśāstra.* The *Cāṅkṣuṣīya* is a small treatise in the Sūtra form dealing with sixty-seven items of statecraft relating to the duties of a sovereign and his officers. A comparison of the items suggests that many of them have been elaborated by Kauṭilya and some of the opinions quoted by him under Mānavas are found in this work.

Calcutta Review, vol. 76, no. 3, September, 1940

ANIL BARAN ROY.—*Advaita of the gītā.*

N. N. CHOUDHURY SASTRI.—*A Peep into the Tantra and its Deity.* Some Tantric deities have been described, and the affinities and the differences between Kālī and Tārā of the Tantra on the one hand and those of the Buddhist and Jaina pantheon on the other have been indicated.

MID. ABDUL BAQI.—*An Arabic Scholar on Ancient Indian Literature.* Gholam Ali Azad born in Bilgram in the latter half of the 17th century devoted two chapters of his Arabic work *Subhatul Marajan* to a critical review of Indian poetry. He has also dealt with biographies of some distinguished Indian literary men from the days of the Muslim conquest down to his time.

KALIDAS MOOKERJEE.—*Jāisi's 'Padumāvata' and its Bengali Version by Ālāol: A Comparison.*

Ibid., vol. 77, no. 3, (Dec. 1940)

- S. N. HAIDAR RIZVI.—*Education in Muslim India*. The education in royal family, condition of mass education, and educational policy of the Central Government under different Muslim kings and in different Muslim states, method of education in primary and secondary schools have been discussed.

Ibid., vol. 78, no. 2, February, 1941

- RAMESH CHANDRA BANERJEE.—*New Light on Kashiram Das*. In a recently discovered manuscript copy of the Bengali *Mahābhārata* of Kashiram Das, it is mentioned that the poet was able to compose only Ādi, Sabhā and a portion of the Vana parvan of the book which was completed by one Sutajit, son of Sikhara in 1646 or 1676 A.C. Whether the remaining cantos of the *Mahābhārata* were composed by the same Sutajit is a matter for conjecture.

Indian Culture, vol. VII, no. 2, (Oct.-Dec.)

- D. R. BHANDARKAR.—*Indo-Parthian dynasty of Vonones*. Vonones appears to be the first prince of the Indo-Parthian dynasty and the Founder of the Indo-Parthian Era.
- S. C. SARKAR.—*Ancient Indian Geography*. This Geographical note is based on a section of Sum. pa. Mkhān. po's compilation 'Dpag. bsam. ljon. bsañ, (*Bhadrakalpādruma*) written with a view to guiding the Buddhist monks visiting the places of pilgrimage in India. Tibetan texts together with English translations and informative notes are given.
- H. C. ROY.—*Some India-Office Letters of the Reign of Tipu Sultan*.
- H. C. ROYCHOUDHURY.—*On the Emperor Mahīpāla of the Pratibāra dynasty*. Some reasons are advanced to show that Mahīpāla was identical with Bhoja II, and that he could not have borne the names Kṣitīpāla, Vināyakapāla and Herambapāla.
- BENOY CHANDRA SEN.—*Administration under the Pālas and the Senas*. The designations with functions and duties of the officials who were employed in the works of administration under the Pālas and the Senas as culled from the available records of the two Imperial dynasties of Bengal are given in this paper. The Government which prevailed throughout the period is said to be of a monarchical type without constitutional checks.

B. C. LAW.—*Some Ancient Indian Tribes*. It is a short account of some nine tribes of Ancient India such as the Kuntalas, the Vāṇadhānas, the Ātreyas, the Sūrpārakas, the Nāsikyas, the Bharadvājas, the Lampakas, the Arbudas, and the Khasas as known from the literary and the epigraphic records.

BAIJNATH PURI.—*Nana, the Mother-Goddess in India and Western Asia*.

The Goddess *Nana* or *Nanai* represented on the Kuṣāṇa coins along with Oppo = Umeśa, has been identified with the Goddess *Ambā* who is mentioned as the Mother-Goddess in the *R̥gveda* and whose association with Rudra is clear from the Vedic Literature. The old Babylonian pantheon also presents the Goddess in this particular aspect.

BATA KRISHNA GHOSH.—*Germanic and Sanskrit*.

Jaina Antiquary, vol. VI, no. II

KAMTA PRASAD JAIN.—*Aśoka and Jainism*. In the opinion of the writer of this continued article Aśoka whom the Buddhists claim to be one belonging to their faith was really a Jaina in his religion as most of the teachings in his edicts conform to those of Jainism.

G. N. SALETORE.—*The Southern Aśmaka*. It is concluded that Sapādalakṣa is synonymous with Aśmaka, the rugged or mountainous country which was also named as Bārbārā, with Pōdama as its capital.

HIRALAL JAIN.—*Remnants of the 12th Jaina Śrutāṅga Dīṭṭhivāda*. The *Dhavalasiddhāntas* are works based on the lost *Dīṭṭhivāda*, the 12th canonical treatise of the Jainas. The writer of this paper has gathered some information about the nature and extent of the *Dīṭṭhivāda* from a commentary on a portion of the *Dhavalasiddhāntas* still in manuscript. The *Siddhāntas* are surmised to have been composed in the early Christian era. The commentary which has been named *Dhavalā* is the work of Virasena who refers to an extensive literature associated with the *Dhavalasiddhāntas*.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, vol. XXVI, pt. 4

K. K. BASU.—*Golconda Court Letters*. A number of documents addressed to or connected with Abdullāh Qutb Shāh, the Sultan of Golconda has been translated into English. Here are letters from Shāh Abbas II of Persia, and Shāh Jahān, Aurangzeb, Darā Shikoh and Sultan Muhammad of the Mughal court, and also a deed executed by Abdullāh Qutb Shāh

in favour of Aurangzeb. They reveal a state of strained political relation between Delhi and Golconda.

- A. BANERJI-SASTRI.—*Kurkihar Bronze Inscriptions*. Important inscriptions of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal exist in the Museum at Kurkihar, which is identified here with the ancient Kukkuṭapadavihāra (cock's-foot hill) of the Buddhists. The names of kings, whose inscriptions have found place in the Museum, and the names of persons and places occurring in the inscriptions have been mentioned and a chronology and genealogy of the Pāla kings together with a list of incidents of Pāla history have been given.

KALIKINKAR DATTA.—*A Letter of Shāh Alam II to George III in 1772*. When Warren Hastings stopped payment of the tribute of the provinces to Shāh Alam II, the last Emperor of Delhi, the latter made a futile representation to George III of England for relief.

JAGADISH NARAYAN SARKAR.—*Mir Jumla and the English in Madras (1655-58)*.

- S. C. SARKAR.—*A Tibetan Account of Bengal*. The account contains English translations of extracts from the *Dpag. bsam. ljon. bsañ* which is a late Tibetan compilation from early historical works of Indian scholars.

Journal of the Greater India Society, vol. VIII, no. 1, (January, 1941)

K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI.—*Recent Progress in Malayan Archaeology*.

NIHAR RANJAN RAY.—*Theravāda Buddhism in Burma*. This is an account of the activities of the promoters of the Theravāda Buddhism in Burma from its introduction in Pagan in 1057 to the fall of the Pagan dynasty about 1287 A.C.

Journal of Indian History, vol. XIX, pt. 3, Dec., 1940

B. C. LAW.—*The Utkalas and Uḍras in Ancient India*. The information about the Utkalas and the Uḍras as also their habitats has been culled from inscriptions and literature.

D. TRIVEDA.—*The Fasli Era*. The writer is not inclined to believe that the Fasli Era was started by Akbar because it had been in use before the birth of the emperor. The starting point of the era is fixed at 591 A.C. which may coincide with the birth of Harṣavardhana, or the accession of Maṅgaliśa or Śaśāṅka.

- BAIJ NATH PURI.—*Place-names in the Kuṣāṇa Inscriptions*. From the identification of some Geographical names found in the inscriptions of the Kuṣāṇas, it is inferred that the Kuṣāṇa power extended from Afghanistan to Benares in the east, and from Kashmīr to lower Sind in the south-west.
- S. HANUMANTHA RAO.—*Mahāyāna Buddhism and Paurāṇic Hinduism: Mutual Influences*. The common phases of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Paurāṇic Hinduism show that Mahāyānism was only a sectarian phase of the great Vaiṣṇava movement.
- P. K. GODE.—*Date of Rākṣasa-kāvya or Kāvya-rākṣasa before A.D. 1000*. Mss. of the commentary on this kāvya deposited in different libraries have been examined. One ms. is dated 1139 A.D. which is therefore the later limit for its age.
- A. L. SRIVASTAVA.—*Was the Abdālī Invasion of 1766-67 a real menace to Bengal?* The writer again asserts in this reply to the rejoinder of Dr. N. L. Chatterjee that the Abdālī Invasion of 1766-67 was not a real menace to the safety of Bengal.

Journal of Oriental Research, vol. XIV, pt. II, (April-June, 1940)

- C. R. SANKARAN.—*The Concept of Keynote in the Taittirīya-prātiśākhya*. In this paper on the fundamental musical note in the scheme of the Vedic chants as conceived in the *Taittirīya-prātiśākhya*, the nature and significance of the Svarita accent with a special reference to its Pracaya variety have been discussed.
- S. R. BALASUBRAHMANYAM.—*Preserve the Ancient Monuments*. An appeal has been made for the better preservation of the ancient temples of India, and their importance for the social and cultural history of the people emphasized.
- N. VENKATARAMANAYYA.—*Jālavāḥi, Velāvāḥi and Lenkavāḥi*. The three terms which form the title of the paper occur in inscriptions and literary works in Telugu and Kannaḍa. They refer to some political and military obligations that certain classes of dependants had to carry on in favour of their masters.
- N. CHIDAMBARANATHA CHETTIAR.—*Tamil Syntax*.
- V. H. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI.— भवभूतिः कलहारसूत्र (Bhavabhūti and the *Sentiment of Pathos*). The literary value and the all-embracing ex-

cellence of the Pathetic Sentiment have been discussed, and the incomparable power of Bhavabhūti in delineating the sentiment has been shown through quotations.

- A. VENKATASUBBIAH.—*Vedic Studies: The Act of Truth in the R̥gveda*. Instances have been cited particularly from the *R̥gveda* where an utterance not contaminated by untruth and insincerity is said to have become a reality through actual incidents.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, (letters) vol. V, no. 3, 1940

- A. AIYAPPAN.—*Śiva-seal of Mohenjo-daro*. The figure seated in the Yogic pose engraved on some seals of Mohenjo-daro which has been identified by Sir John Marshall as Śiva-Paśupati has been proved by some scholars to be the figure of Agni; but the writer of this article is of opinion that it is nearer Śiva than Agni.
- D. C. SIRCAR.—*Digvijaya of king Candra of the Meharauli Pillar Inscription*. From some inscriptions especially that of the Meharauli Pillar, it is shown that the description of land claimed to have been under the rule of, or to have been traversed in course of *digvijaya* by a king, was conventional though not absolutely without foundation. The *Candra* of this inscription is said to be none but Candragupta II of the Imperial Gupta dynasty.
- NANI MADHAB CHAUDHURY.—*Cult of the Old Lady*. The forms of worship of the Old Lady (*Burī*) are analysed and it is found that they have assimilated features from the ancient Caitra festival of the Śaiva character on the one hand and from a tribal fertility cult on the other.
- W. J. CULSHAW.—*Some Notes on Bongaism*. The word 'Bonga' in Santali does not convey the idea of an impersonal and all-pervading power. Pantheistic notions among the present day Santals are a late accretion due to Hindu influences.
- CHINTAHARAN CHAKRABORTY.—*Sanskrit works of Maharaja Viśvanath Singh of Rewah*. Of the works of Viśvanātha Singh of Rewah, the *Rādhāvallabhīyamataprakāśa*, a commentary on the *Brahmasūtra* was composed in 1840 A.C. The special importance of this work lies in the fact that it deals with the doctrines of the Rādhāvallabhīs in Sanskrit, though the school of thought is known to be of comparatively modern origin.

Ibid., vol. VI, no. 1, 1940

- D. N. MAJUMDAR.—*Some Aspects of the Cultural Life of the Khasas of the cis-Himalayan Region*. The economic life, social structure, cultural life, marital life, family organisation etc. of the Khasas or Khasiyas of the cis-Himalayan region with special reference to those living in Jaunsar-Bawar in the Dehra Dun district are described.

Journal of the University of Bombay, vol. IX, pt. 2 (September, 1940)

- H. D. VELANKAR.—*Hymns to Indra by the Gr̥tsamadas*. The hymns from the *R̥gveda* (II, 11-22) addressed to Indra by the Gr̥tsamadas have been translated into English with annotations.
- D. N. BHAGAVAT.—*Buddhist Monachism and Post-Aśokan Brāhmī Inscriptions*. The donatory Buddhist inscriptions in Brāhmī script belonging to the period after Aśoka contain names of Bhikkhus and Bhikkhunis, and in many cases, also the names of places they come from. The places that appear to have grown as centres of Buddhism in the times of these inscriptions are Nandinagara, Kuraghara, Kurara, Ujjen, Vedisā, Madhuvana and Vāḍivāhana. Vāḍivāhana seems to have been an important monastic centre of Buddhist nuns as donations are made to a group of nuns from that place. •
- P. K. GODE.—*Dates of Udayarāja and Jagaddhara*. Udayarāja, the author of the *Rājavinoda*, an historical kāvya dealing with the life of Sultan Mahamud Begadhā of Ahmedabad has been placed between 1458 and 1469 A.C. Jagaddhara, the well-known commentator of Bhavabhūti's *Mālatīmādhava*, has been assigned to the 14th century A.C.
- S. B. VELANKAR.—*Similes and Metaphors in R̥gveda*. This instalment completes the English translation of Arnold Hirzel's paper in German on the R̥gvedic similes.
- UMAKANT P. SHAH.—*Iconography of the Jain Goddess Ambikā*.

New Indian Antiquary, vol. III, no. 10 (January, 1941)

- S. S. SURYANARAYANA SASTRI.—*Paramārthasāra of Ādiśeṣa*. This philosophical treatise in Sanskrit dealing with questions concerning Ātman, Jīva, Saṃsāra and their relations has been translated into English and annotated with explanatory Notes.

- D. B. DISKALKAR.—*Inscriptions of Kathiawad*. Twenty-two inscriptions found in Kathiawad have been edited in this instalment. They are dated between 1694 and 1748 A.C.

Poona Orientalist, vol. V, no. 4

- R. SHAMA SASTRY.—*Robita: A Sure Test of the Vedic Eclipse-cycle*. Rohita mentioned as a deity in the hymns of the *Atharvaveda* is identified here with a cyclic solar eclipse. When this eclipse occurred cycle after cycle, the hymns concerned were recited. With a view to settling the Vedic chronology some verses of the Ṛgvedic Vāmasūkta have been explained in the article, and 3102 B.C. has been fixed as the initial year of the Kali Era.
- P. C. DIVANJI.—*Yogavāsīṣṭha on the Origin of Indian Philosophy*. The *Yogavāsīṣṭha* contains an account of the efforts that were made at three different periods for the alleviation of miseries of mankind. If interpreted historically, the account suggests that it was in the third stage of the organised life of the Indo-Aryan people that philosophical speculation was started. *Adhyātmaśāstra* was then imparted by sages from the north-eastern direction first to the members of the ruling classes as they through their selfish activities had been bringing miseries on themselves and their subjects.
- DHIRENDRA NATH MOOKERJĪ.—*The Contemporaneity of Candragupta and Kanishka*. The writer contends that the Kuṣāṇas and the early Imperial Guptas were contemporaneous, and Kanishka and Candragupta I flourished about 58 B.C.
- K. MADHAVA KRISHNA SARMA.—*The Jyotirvidābharaṇa and the Nine Jewels*. The author of the paper does not put any reliance on the statement of the *Jyotirvidābharaṇa* which makes Varāhamihira and the other "Jewels" contemporaneous.
- E. P. RADHAKRISHNAN.—*A Note on Few Works Entitled Tarkadīpikā*.
- M. P. L. SASTRY.—*Nañjarājayaśobbhūṣaṇa, and its Author*. Narasiṃha Kavi, the author of the *Nañjarājayaśobbhūṣaṇa*, a treatise on poetics wrote two other works called *Candrakalākalyāṇa* and *Śivadayāsahasra* which supply us with additional information about the author.

Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, vol. XXXI, no. 2

MOHAN SINGH.—*The legend of Prahlāda*. In this continued article, the historical and the metaphysical interpretations of the legend of Prahlāda are given. So far as the historicity of the legend is concerned Prahlāda who was the successor of Hiranyakaśipu, the non-Aryan king, whose capital was Mūlāsthāna, modern Multan bore adversity with glowing stoicism. The metaphysical interpretation of the legend is that Prahlāda as *ānanda* and as *bhakti* appeals to us and guides us on the path of life. It recalls to us the triumph of good over evil and devotion over pride.

M. K. VENKATASAM PANTULU.—*The Triple Basis of the Vedānta*. The writer of the paper discusses the nature of Ātman, Jīva and Jagat that form the principal subject of speculation in the three basic texts of Vedānta, viz., the *Upaniṣad*, the *Bhagavadgītā* and *Brahmasūtra*. Allied topics of karma, jñāna, yoga, sannyāsa and upāsana have also been dealt with in the paper.

L. K. BALARATNAM.—*Onam, the Characteristic National Festival of Malabar*. The Festival of Onam which is celebrated in the first month of every Malayalam year which generally falls in the rainy season, commemorates the good reign of a legendary king. The Festival has been described and its origin has been traced to the Bali-Vāmana episode of the Hindu mythology.

S. S. SANTHANAM.—*Local Administration in Ancient South India*.

Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Parisat Patrikā, vol. 47, no. 2

DINESH CHANDRA BHATTACHARYA.—প্রগল্ভাচার্য (Pragalbhācārya). Pragalbhācārya flourished in Bengal in the middle of the 15th century and was an author and a teacher of Navyanyāya system of philosophy.

PRABODH CHANDRA SEN.—প্রাচীন ভারতে ইতিহাস চর্চা (*Study of History in Ancient India*). The belief that the people in Ancient India were averse to the study of history has been criticised in this article and the historical element in ancient Indian literature has been pointed out.

VIDYARANYA SWAMI.—সুদ্বৈতবাদ (*Suddhādvaitavāda*). The Vedānta doctrine propounded by Vallabhācārya are known as *Suddhādvaitavāda*, but older ācāryas are found to designate the absolute non-dualism of Śaṅkara by the same appellation.

The Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. XXVII

March, 1946

No. 3

Abhidhamma Abhivinaya

(in the first two Piṭakas of the Pali Canon.)

In the first two Piṭakas of the Pali Canon the word *abbhidhamma* occurs now and again. Although not prominent, on the occasions when it appears it is usually in some noteworthy context. Like many another Pali word it is a word with a history, but a "history of which we know very little."¹ It is the word which at some date, probably between the First Council and Buddhaghosa's time, had attained a sufficient degree of importance to give the name to the third, the Abhidhamma Piṭaka. It did not however spring into existence when the need was felt to draw up a third Piṭaka, for it had existed and been used before this event. That the term *abbhidhamma* when found in the first two Piṭakas cannot be taken to refer to the third Piṭaka, admittedly later, or at least not to it in its finished closed form, unless the term when it occurs can be regarded as a later interpolation, has I think, been amply demonstrated by Oldenberg² and Max Müller.³

These authorities say nothing to rule out the possibility, which must ever be borne in mind, that the first and second Piṭakas, on the occasions when they mention *abbhidhamma*, may be paving the way, however slightly, for the later emergence of the third Piṭaka. For as Oldenberg and Max Müller recognise, the stuff of it, the material out of which it grew and on which it was based was in existence before the Piṭaka itself. The question is, did the Abhidhamma Piṭaka develop in part from anything meant by *abbhidhamma* in the Vinaya and Sutta Piṭakas? Can we hope to find in their references to the term any substance out of which the last Piṭaka was

1 Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Manual of Buddhism*, London, 1932, p. 27.

2 *Vinayapitakam*, vol. i. 1879, Intr. p. x ff.

3 *Dhammapada* (S.B.E. X) 1st edn. 1881 (2nd edn. 1898, 1924), Intr. xl ff.

elaborated? Does any significance which they ascribe to *abhidhamma* lead on by a natural process to its meaning and range as title of the third Piṭaka? The task of answering questions such as these is all the harder since the meaning or meanings of *abhidhamma* in the Vinaya and Suttas is vague and doubtful and cannot be precisely determined.

There is no doubt that the word, especially perhaps as title of the third Piṭaka, has some historical connection with quite a different term, namely *mātikā*. This latter word, which also has a history, came to mean "openings", and so "headings, lists, summaries." E. J. Thomas says that it is "a term now applied to the lists of subjects discussed in the class of Abhidhamma, but also used as a synonym of Abhidhamma",⁴ while Mrs. Rhys Davids remarks that "at the beginning of the Third Piṭaka one comes upon a first section called *Mātikā* (consisting of a dual list of subjects: so many coming under "Abhidhamma", so many under "Suttanta"). And it is presumably out of these *mātikās* of the former kind that the Abhidhamma-Piṭaka was in part developed."⁵ They were, as E. M. Hare says, "the proto-*abhidhamma*."⁶

Passages in the Vinaya,⁷ noticed by Mrs. Rhys Davids, and also in the Sutta Piṭaka,⁸ refer to *vinaya*, *dhamma* and *mātikā*. The word *mātikā* was evidently dropped at some time in favour of the word Abhidhamma as the name of the third Piṭaka, even as the word *dhamma* gave way to the word Sutta as the name of the second Piṭaka. It must be supposed that the *mātikā*, headings, notes as it were, not written, but memorised and mentally referred to by a teacher when speaking on certain subjects or aspects of certain subjects, were expanded and elaborated into material that, because it was so much fuller and more discursive than the mere lists, was worthy of arrangement as a third Piṭaka. The *mātikā* themselves remain in the Abhidhamma "books", where they form tables of contents.

So much then may be accepted as historically sound: that some Vinaya and Sutta references to *mātikā* are in fact references to the type of material that was later incorporated into the Abhidhamma Piṭaka; and that references in these same passages to *vinaya* and *dhamma* are in fact references to the

4 *Hist. Bud. Thought*, p. 266.

5 *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 27.

6 *G.S.* iii. 134, n. 2

7 *Vin.* i. 119, 337, ii. 8.

8 *M.* i. 223, *A.* i. 117, ii. 147, iii. 179, 361, *D.* ii. 125, all stock formula. See E. J. Thomas, *Hist Bud Thought*, p. 266, n. 1 (where for *Ang.* ii, 167 read 147, and for *Digha* ii, 123 read 125).

type of material that was incorporated into the Vinaya and Sutta(nta) Piṭakas respectively.

But I am not here concerned with questions of the date, the development, the range" or the subject-matter of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka. I want instead to draw attention to those comparatively rare passages in the Vinaya Piṭaka and the Sutta Piṭaka where the term *abhidhamma* occurs. For an analysis of these passages may reveal some part of the history of the word, or of its position and significance in the training, outlook and aspirations of Gotama's early followers.

"Significance" cannot be appreciated unless the meaning be understood. This will to a large extent depend upon the meaning or meanings ascribed to the great word *dhamma*; but an investigation of this term would be far too lengthy and it has been undertaken by others.¹⁰ Let us here see *dhamma* as doctrine, as what had been and was being taught to the disciples both by the lord and by his fellow workers, religious views, precepts and sayings which, before being codified into an external body of teaching, were as yet appealing direct to the conscience, *dhamma*, in man, and to the deity, *ātman* and *dhamma*, which in the sixth century B.C. in India was held to be immanent in him. Let us see *dhamma* as religion, perhaps as philosophy, as that which was man's guide and stay, his urge to lead the good life, *brahmacariya*, his conscience.

Abhi-, prefixed to a noun, has in general an intensive meaning such as super, higher, additional, supplementary; and it can also mean "what pertains to", "concerning." The *Atthasālinī*, in discussing the prefix *abhi-*, takes it to show "growth, proper attributes, reverence, differentiation and surpassing worth" when prefixed to *dhamma*.¹¹ Thus for the compound *abhidhamma* we get some such phrase as "the higher doctrine", "additional to the doctrine" or "what pertains to the doctrine". It is possible that the cleavage between these two interpretations is not very great.

9 See Max Müller, *Dhammapada*, 2nd edn., p. xvii; Rhys Davids, *Ilbert Lectures*, 1881, p. 49f. Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Sakya*, p. 401ff.; B. C. Law, *Hist. Pālī Lit.* i, p. 303 ff.; E. J. Thomas, *Hist. Bud. Thought*, 274.

10 Mrs. Rhys Davids in several recent works, and W. Geiger, *Pālī Dhamma*, 1920.

11 *Asl.* 20.

12 Childers, *Dictionary*, 1879, Max Müller, *Dhammapada*, 2nd edn., p. xvii. See also the reason given for this translation by E. J. Thomas, *Hist. Bud. Thought*, p. 285.

Pioneers in Pali studies thought of *abhidhamma* as “metaphysics.”¹² Sound reasons for rejecting this translation were given by Rhys Davids in 1881.¹³ The term had already been subjected to rigorous pruning in 1879 by Oldenberg who, in a note in the Introduction to his edition of the *Vinaya-piṭaka*,¹⁴ points out the passage in *Mahāvagga* I. 36, 12 where it is required of a teacher that he should be able to instruct his pupil: *abhidhamme vinetum abhiwinaye vinetum*.¹⁵ Oldenberg remarks, “this of course is only meant to say that his instruction is to be in that which pertains to the Dhamma and Vinaya.” And this was the rendering he put upon these phrases in translating them in *Vinaya Texts* in 1881.¹⁶

Yet in spite of this possible, although less pregnant rendering of *abhi*-, Rhys Davids in 1894, in translating the *Milindapañha*,¹⁷ reverted to the earlier notion imputed to *abhidhamma* of “transcendental doctrine,”¹⁸ metaphysics. He thus showed a certain partiality for this rendering which I think has influenced all subsequent translators. Yet while pointing out that the pair *abhidhamma abhiwinaya* is “a phrase very instructive as to the correct rendering of the much misunderstood word *abhidhamma*”, he translates it as “the higher subtleties of the Dhamma and the Vinaya”. It is very likely that the “subtleties” pervading the seven “books” of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka, psycho-logico-ethical (Dhammasaṅgaṇi, Vibhaṅga, Dhātukathā), doctrinal (Kathāvatthu), characterological (Puggalapaññatti), eschatological (Yamaka) and those concerned with logical relations (Paṭṭhāna), have also done something to colour translators’ views, especially of those working after the complete publication by the Pali Text Society of all the Abhidhamma “books”, as to a suitable rendering for *abhidhamma* when it does not refer to the third Piṭaka. And in this they may not be without justification, the more so if, as does not however seem capable of demonstration, *abhidhamma* could be established as a connecting term between *mātikā* and the Abhidhamma Piṭaka, expanding the “headings” of the former into the substance of the latter.

Later translators, Mrs. Rhys Davids, F. L. Woodward, E. M. Hare, Chalmers for example, taking *abhi*-, not as “what pertains to”, but as

13 *Hibbert Lectures*, 1881, p. 49.

14. Vol. i, Intr. p. xii, n. 2.

15 Quoted in *Asi.* 20.

16 For the division of this work of translating the Vinaya into *Vinaya Texts*, see *Book of the Discipline*, i, Editorial Note, p. lxi.

17 *Questions of King Milinda*, 237, where see n. 2. 18 Childers, *Dictionary*.

“higher”, emphasise to a greater or less degree the “subtlety” which they understand this prefix to imply. The following instances may be adduced:

Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues*, iii. 246, “the advanced teaching of Doctrine.”

F. L. Woodward, *Gradual Sayings*, i. 276 “extra doctrine.”

“ “ “ “ “ v. 19 (20, 64), 139, 217 “further doctrine.”

E. M. Hare, “ “ “ iii. 85, iv. 267, “More-Dhamma.”

Lord Chalmers, *Further Dialogues*, i. 155, “quintessential Doctrine.”

“ “ “ “ “ i. 333, “higher branches of the Doctrine.”

E. J. Thomas, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 159, “special dhamma.”

“ “ “ “ “ “ “ p. 276, “further dhamma or special dhamma.”

G. P. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* (art: Abhidhamma Piṭaka), “special dhamma (i.e. the doctrine pure and simple without admixture of literary treatment and personalities, etc.).”

This “special dhamma,” as Malalasekera implies, refers to the mode of teaching found in the Abhidhamma Piṭaka. This is by general, abstract statements, *nippariyāyena*,¹⁹ and is thus opposed to the Suttanta method which is *pariyāyena*, that is *ad hominem*, with picturesque, illustrative and figurative language. This method is as vivid and compelling as the Abhidhamma method is dry and scholastic.

In addition, two of the above translators, no doubt realising the shifting and elusive nature of the word *abhidhamma*, have in their translations also kept the word in Pali²⁰ with a capital A, as though it stood, if not for the third Piṭaka in its completed state, then for it in some embryonic state. And it is very possible that these two careful scholars and excellent translators did mean *abhidhamma*, in these contexts where they leave it untranslated, to have such a reference. It is true that Oldenberg and Max Müller, by basing their arguments on the Vinaya accounts, have established that the Abhidhamma as a Piṭaka was not known by the time of the first Council. But yet, since a third Piṭaka was at some time found worthy to

¹⁹ *Asl.* 317, *Vism.* 473, 499.

²⁰ Chalmers, *Fur. Dial.*, ii. 137; E. M. Hare, *G.S.*, iii. 280. Neither annotates the word.

take its place beside the other two Piṭakas, not only must the material of which it came to be composed have had some existence prior to the compilation of this Piṭaka itself, but it must have been of such a date or nature as to fit suitably into neither the Vinaya Piṭaka nor the Sutta Piṭaka.

I would also point out that the compilation of the third Piṭaka was probably not begun until the other two were closed, and was perhaps only begun when need was felt to clear up and, by catechetical methods, to pronounce upon some outstanding and still debatable points. In this case, the meaning, whatever it is, of *abhidhamma* in its occurrences in the two older Piṭakas, will not necessarily have developed into whatever is the meaning of Abhidhamma as the name of the third Piṭaka. Who can say, for example, whether the monks who were talking *abhidhamma* talk (*G.S.* iii. 280) or those who were holding divergent views upon *abhidhamma* (*Fur. Dial.* ii. 137) were dealing with a type of subject that was later collected into the third Piṭaka, or whether they were concerned with the doctrine pure and simple as this had been transmitted to them, and unembellished by additional material calling for specially erudite mastery and learning?

The Commentaries cannot yield one reliable, stable meaning for *abhidhamma*. When they interpret the term, which is not always, as often as not some common factor, providing a sure clue to any growing or grown agreement, as to a definite meaning, is lacking. *VA.* 990 calls it "analysis into name and form," *nāmarūpapariccheda*,²¹ which indeed has quite a taste of the third Piṭaka about it. *AA.* iii. 271 says that it is "the best (or highest) doctrine, *uttamadhamma*"; *MA.* iv. 29, "very distinguished doctrine", *abbiṇṇiṭṭha dhamma*. *MA.* iii. 185 takes the term to stand for the Piṭaka of that name, adding that it cannot exist without the Dhammahadaya-vibhaṅga²² together with the Duka and Tika (*-ppaṭṭhānas*, here called *mātikā*). *DA.* 1047 and the Commentary on *A.* v. 24 are perhaps the most interesting. They are identical. They regard as fourfold: *dhamma* *abhidhamma* *vinaya* *abbhivāyā*, and give two explanations for each word, thus: *dhamma* is the Suttapiṭaka, *abhidhamma* the seven *pakaraṇāni*, literary compositions (into which the Abhidhamma Piṭaka was eventually arranged), *vinaya* the two Vibhaṅgas, and *abbhivāyā* the Khandhakas and

²¹ Also the name of an *Abhidhamma Piṭaka* treatise, published in *J.P.T.S.*, 1914.

²² Last portion of the Vibhaṅga.

the Parivāra. The three Piṭakas are thus accounted for, with the Vinaya divided under two headings. Alternatively, these Commentaries call *dhamma* the Suttapiṭaka and the Abhidhammapiṭaka, *abhidhamma* the fruits and the ways, *maggaphalāni*; *vinaya* the whole of the Vinayapiṭaka, and *abbhivimaya* the task of allaying the corruptions, *kilesavūpasamakaraṇa*.

In this last interpretation of *abbhivinaya*, and it is the only one of its kind, presumably inner mental discipline is set in antithesis to the external control of the outward behaviour of monks as promulgated in the Pāṭi-mokkha rules. As such, it was further, higher, extra. Likewise would *abbhivinaya* have this meaning if taken to stand for "the whole of the Vinaya Piṭaka." For then it would surely imply a wide knowledge, a deep understanding and a full mastery of Vibhaṅgas, Khandhakas and perhaps of the later Parivāra. It would doubtless include a knowledge of the history of the rules, the ability to answer questions such as were put at the first Council: where, because of what, in regard to whom and so on, were the various rules promulgated(?), their reasons and explanations, their exceptions, the agreements and discrepancies of various comparable rules, their groupings, their cross-references from Vibhaṅgas to Khandhakas and *vice versa*, and so forth along many lines of study.

But no Piṭakan passage throws any light on what was meant by *abbhivinaya*. A Parivāra passage²³ says that *vinaya* is a designation or description, *paññatti*, and *abbhivimaya* an analysis or classification, *vibhatti*. But this is as near as we get. And this is in a compilation that is admittedly later than the rest of the Vinaya Piṭaka. While this passage is I think the only Piṭakan reference to *abbhivimaya* in separation from *abhidhamma*, in those other cases where the two are associated, it is safe to assume that the *abhi-* will have the same connotation; so that if we say "the higher doctrine" we must say "the higher discipline," and if "what pertains to the doctrine" then "what pertains to the discipline."

While I think it very likely that there are not more than ten references to the word *abhidhamma* in the first two Piṭakas (not counting parallel passages, of which there may be five or six), in four of these the word is closely associated with *abbhivinaya*. Thus although *abhidhamma* is found standing unaccompanied by *abbhivinaya*, with the exception of the late passage just referred to *abbhivinaya* is not found dissociated from *abhi-*

dhamma. This relatively infrequent pair of terms no doubt derives from a more frequent, probably comprehensive and undoubtedly great pair, *dhamma vinaya*. In this, *dhamma* usually precedes *vinaya*, as is also always the case in the derivative pair.

Let us now look at those four occasions when the derivative pair appears in the Vinaya and Sutta Piṭakas. In the *Mahāvagga* of the Vinaya²⁴ the ability to teach *abhidhamma* and *abhiwinaya* to a pupil is brought forward as two out of a group of five qualities, among a long list of other groups, each of five qualities, the possession of which marks a monk as one able to ordain, to give guidance and to be waited upon by a novice. Although these groups are not exactly stereotyped, the whole passage could only have come to fruition in its present stylistic form at a comparatively late stage in the growth of the canon. Yet Oldenberg is probably right in seeing here in *abhi-* "what pertains to", rather than the "higher". For a monk would hardly instruct a pupil in "higher doctrine and discipline", but he should be able to teach him what pertains to doctrine and discipline.

In the *Saṅgīti Suttanta*,²⁵ among the ten qualities that "make for warding" is that conveyed by the sentence: "a monk strives after doctrine, *dhammakāma*, he is pleasant to converse with, he rejoices exceedingly, *ulārapāmuṇṇa*, in *abhidhamma abhiwinaya*." This whole passage on "living warded" also appears at *Āṅg.* v. 23 f. while *Āṅg.* v. 25 states that a monk who lives so warded may be considered by the elders, by those of middle standing and by the novices as fit for encouragement. The same quality, of striving after doctrine, etc., also occurs among those ten qualities endowed with which an elder is said to live happily or comfortably, *phāsu viharati*,²⁶ and again it is given as one of the ten traditional marks of a believer,²⁷ and yet again as one of the ten conditions to be remembered as conducing to concord and harmony.²⁸ This passage then, recurring six times in identical terms, and always in a set of ten items,²⁹ may be said to have attained the status of a formula. In an oral and then literary method which came to rely so greatly as did Pali on the use of formulae for learning and teaching, it is worth noticing that *abhidhamma abhiwinaya* were not left out. I have quoted their formulae. In it they are associated with

24 *Vin.* i. 64; cf. i. 68 and above, p. 294.

25 *D.* iii. 267.

26 *A.* v. 201.

27 *A.* v. 339.

28 *A.* v. 89ff.

29 The ten items, of which this is one, are not on all the occasions when they occur quite the same as one another.

dhama as *dhammakāma*; and in it they are qualified by a very strong expression, *ulāra-pāmuja*, "an exceeding delight in."

Now I do not think that this expression would have been used unless *abhidhamma abhiwinaya* had been intended to stand for something more than *dhama* and *vinaya*, perhaps in the sense of some more than usually complete grasp and mastery of them due to further study and reflection, and resulting in a specially scrupulous observance of the matters inculcated by them. A monk becomes one who is fond of doctrine, strives after it, and he is also one who rejoices exceedingly in what concerns it and what concerns discipline. And this may no doubt be in regard to their higher and more controversial reaches, or to his power to grasp the various parts of either in relation to its whole, or to their subjective demands on him to put forth greater energy in acting with conscience and discipline as his guides.

With this use of *abhi-* as standing for "something more" in the sense suggested, one might compare the prefix *adhi-* in the triad *adhisīla adhicitta adhipaññā*. The descriptions of these conditions given at *Āṅg.* i. 235 to my mind make it quite clear that *adhi-* here points to "the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher wisdom," and should therefore not be translated by "as to" morality, etc., as in other contexts might be allowable. A *Vinaya* passage³⁰ also lends weight to this view, as I have elsewhere attempted to show.³¹ So too does the Commentary on this *Āṅguttara* passage itself.³² It puts forward no hint of *adhi-* here standing for "as to," and although not explicitly equating *adhi-* with *ati-*, "superior," the meaning is shown to be tantamount to this. For the Commentary explains: "*sīla* is called the five precepts (of morality, *sīla*), deriving from that *adhisīla* means the ten precepts, and deriving from that it means the four precepts of purity. Also all morality that is worldly is *sīla*, what is other-worldly is *adhisīla*. But thought (*citta*) is thought about the realm of sense desires, deriving from that, if it is about the realm of form it is called *adhicitta*, then deriving from that, if it is about the realm of formlessness it is called *adhicitta*. The same holds good of wisdom." Here then is a clear issue, the *Āṅguttara* Commentary saying in no uncertain terms that *adhi-* is here taken as meaning "higher, superior."

The pair of terms, *abhidhamma abhiwinaya*, appears again in a passage at *Āṅg.* i. 288f. = *Āṅg.* iv. 397ff. This sets out to determine how a young

30 *Vin.* iii. 234.

31 *B.D.* ii. 94, n. 3.

32 *AA.* ii. 345-6

man may be gifted with speed, beauty and good proportions. The criterion of speed is said to be knowledge of the four truths of ill; that of good proportions the ability to get as alms the four requisites of a monk's life: robe, food, lodgings and medicine. The four truths of ill and alms came to play such important rôles in their own ways and spheres that they can hardly fail to throw a reflected glory on the criterion of beauty: the young man's ability not to falter but to solve questions³³ put to him on *abhidhamma abbhivinaya*. For it cannot be conceded that this concept ever attained such eminence as to stand beside the truths and the alms on its own merits and without borrowing something of their own significance from them. The passage is stylised and comparatively late, and its internal evidence provides no clue to the meaning that *abhidhamma* and *abbhinaya* may bear here.

Mrs. Rhys Davids has shown in several of her more recent books that the teaching on the four noble truths, as this has been handed down,³⁴ did not belong to the original or even to the earliest Sakya, but was a doctrine that by laying an increased insistence on ill, became rooted as the monastic vogue grew in stature and strength. As such it was however of undoubted potency and importance. Again, alms-gathering and all that this implied for monks and to a lesser degree for donors, was far from being a purely mundane practical business devoid of inner meaning and feature. At the same time the four types of alms that this passage has in mind, and they are the ones which came to be generally used by monks, are in the Vinaya called "extra allowances" to those austere necessities originally prescribed and doubtless exclusively used by Gotama's earliest followers, as later they were the only ones used by some of his more ascetic followers. In view of these considerations, it is not here possible to see in *abhidhamma abbhivinaya* terminology dating from the first inception of the Sakyan movement. Both must be out-growths of and presuppose the existence of an earlier doctrine and an earlier discipline, which had however attained to sufficient degree of coherency and form as to be capable of rational study and application.

E. J. Thomas, referring to this passage,³⁵ says "evidently an elaboration and analysis of the doctrinal principles is intended, just as *abbhinaya* would mean a casuistic discussion of the rules of discipline." There is unluckily no "evidence" for this remark, although its general sentiment

³³ These same words are used in connection with *abhidhammakathā* at *M. i.* 214, see below, p. 303, thus so far as they go being stereotyped.

³⁴ *Gotama the Man*, p. 42ff.

³⁵ *Hist. Bud. Thought*, p. 276.

may be right. All such ascriptions of meaning to *abhidhamma* in passages where the internal evidence is of no avail are transcriptions to it of the subject matter of the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*, of the treatment there accorded to this subject matter, and of the method of approach that is used. There is no *Abbhivinaya Piṭaka*, so no analogous deduction could hold good. I have outlined above the kind of thing I think might have been meant by *abbhivinaya*. I would hesitate to subscribe to the view that it means a "casuistic discussion of the rules of discipline." Cases of conscience were not resolved by discussion, but by an appeal to the rule that the offender had infringed and to the legal exemptions and exceptions which always accompany the statement of the rule. Moreover the *Vinaya* itself lays down no broad principles of ethics which could be applied to individual instances. The *Vinaya* is a mass of particular rules made to fit particular cases of unsuitable behaviour. Some of the moral grounds and the ideal which inspired this system of practical ethics are undoubtedly to be found in the *Suttas*. But if anyone were to decide matters of conscience or of behaviour not legislated for in the *Vinaya*, or apply general principles to individual cases, I should then say that, because he had to take his stand on *Sutta* rather than on *Vinaya* material, he was dealing with *abhidhamma* and not with *abbhivinaya*.

The fourth occasion when the pair *abhidhamma abbhivinaya* occur is in the *Gulissāni Sutta*.¹⁶ This is a record of a talk ascribed to *Sāriputta* about a jungle monk. First, twelve ways are given in which such monk should become, *bhavitabbam*, one endowed with certain qualities. For example, he should know how to behave on his almsround, he should become one who is composed, sedate, of pleasant speech, amiable, energetic, vigilant and mindful, he should become one to guard his faculties and to possess wisdom and concentration. All such conduct of body and mind, stated in an ascending scale of values, is recognisable as deriving from *Vinaya* and *Suttapiṭaka* material. After this stress on what a jungle monk should become (and even more so one from a village, as *Sāriputta* is recorded to say), there follow three cases, interesting and baffling, where endeavour is to be made, *yogo karaṇiyo*, by him. There is first *abhidhamma abbhivinaya*. Endeavour is to be made in these. Next it should be made in those formless freedoms which transcend form, *vimokhā āruppā*; and

thirdly it should be made in conditions of furthermen, *uttarimanussadhammā*.³⁷

This last was of such prime concern and importance as to attract legislation in the Pārājika group of offences, those offences, and there are no more than four of them, which entailed the severest penalty, expulsion from the Order, to which a monk could be subjected. While there is reason to suppose that the teaching on *uttarimanussadhammā* was not a particularly late comer into Sakyan thought, there is no reason to suppose anything of the kind about the formless freedoms. Had both these conceptions had either the appearance of earliness or of lateness, it might have been easier to assess the significance of *abbidhamma* and *abbhivaya* in this passage.

Although neither the concept of freedom nor that of states of furthermen was ever central in the Sakyan teaching, both were of some consequence, the one more in the Suttas and the other perhaps more in the Vinaya. It can hardly be maintained that *abbidhamma abbhivaya* are shedding lustre on these concepts simply because they appear as the first member of this triad. For in the preceding *bhavitabbam* list of desirable conduct and progress, less important and more elementary things stand first and more important, weightier things last. There is no reason to suppose a reversal of this upwardmounting process in the three cases where endeavour is to be made.³⁸ On the other hand, any value that *abbidhamma abbhivaya* may have acquired, and one inclines to think that this will not have been slight, will not have been by reason of their grouping with freedom and states of furthermen, but by reason of their derivation from *dhamma* and *vinaya*.

This remained incalculably the superior, indeed the greatest of all pairs, perhaps the greatest of all concepts. But the jungle monk is not expected to make endeavour in these themselves. Two aspects of them, freedom and states of furthermen, have been ruled out with their specific mention. Is the monk then to make endeavour in any or all of those other numerous, but here undetermined, aspects of doctrine and discipline? This is surely too lop-sided to be reasonable. The possibility then occurs: are *abbidhamma abbhivaya* meant to represent an endeavour to gain learning

³⁷ See *B.D.* i. Intr. xxiv f.

³⁸ The Pārājika concerned with states of furthermen is the last of the Pārājika rules. It is possible that these are arranged in an ascending scale of importance.

and mastery in matters affecting the here and now, while the freedoms and states of furthermen represent a field for endeavour that is to be made in other-worldly aspirations? If so, one may conclude tentatively that the purpose of these three concepts is to cover endeavour in the two spheres of worldly and other-worldly matters. And this would be no straining of the early Buddhist outlook and teaching. In this I think *uttarimanussa-dhammā* will certainly not have been absent, and *vimokkhā*, although probably in its older form of *vimutti*, a term taken over from earlier and contemporary teachings, will also have had a part to play. If the whole passage shows signs of later reduction, this does not prevent it from drawing upon some older traditions.

We come now to three separate occasions, recorded in the *Majjhima* and *Aṅguttara*, of the term *abhidhammakathā*, talk on *abhidhamma*. At *M.* i. 214, quoted at *Asl.* 28-29, Moggallāna is reputed to give as his answer to the question of what would illumine the Gosinga Wood, the view that if two monks are talking *abhidhamma* talk and ask each other questions which they solve without being floored, then their *dhamma* talk, *dhammī kathā*, becomes lovely. It thus seems that the power to converse on *abhidhamma* improves talk on doctrine, and that this is the important thing. The *Atthasālinī* appears to support this view when it says: "Tradition has it that just the monks who know *abhidhamma* (*abhidhammī-kabbhikkhū*) are called talkers on doctrine, the rest, though talking doctrine, are not talkers on doctrine (*dhammakathikā*)."³⁹

Mrs. Rhys Davids sees in this talk the meaning of "higher dharma."⁴⁰ She naturally rejects as unlikely the possibility that Moggallāna "meant anything like the dreary catechisms of the *Abhidhamma* books." Pointing out that "higher dharma, *abhidhamma*, we do not associate with Moggallāna"⁴¹... (and that) we must be here up against an older use of the term", that is older than the *Abhidhamma* as a *Piṭaka*, she concludes that we have Moggallāna "saying what we might call a talk about conscience, or about God." Indeed it may well be that when specific points of doctrine, now found in the *Sutta Piṭaka*, had been thrashed out and clarified by some *abhidhamma* process, by analysis for example of their more detailed intentions and relations, or by assembling the synonyms, then from that larger

39 *Asl.* 29.

41 But see *DA.* 379.

40 *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 213.

knowledge of *dhamma*, that reserve of knowledge, would that same *dhamma* gain in clarity of expression.

Turning now to *Ang.* iii, 392, an episode is given where "several elders" were talking *abhidhamma* talk. It is recorded that a monk, Citta-hatthisāriputta,⁴² interrupted so much that Koṭṭhita asked him to wait until the talk was over. But Citta's friends stood up for him, rebuked Koṭṭhita for his censure, and declared that Citta was wise and able to talk *abhidhamma* talk to the elders. This context suggests that the talk was on something specially difficult or weighty.

Now Mahākoṭṭhita, although outliving him, was one of Gotama's earliest disciples.⁴³ This would quite rule out the possibility that the talk would have been "regarding the Abhidhamma", as Malalasekera affirms.⁴⁴ Yet Mahākoṭṭhita is called in the *Etad Aggas* "chief of the disciples who are masters of logical analysis", and it was he who, in the *Mahāvedalla-sutta*,⁴⁵ catechised Sāriputta, not it may be remarked as master to pupil, but as two mature minds exchanging views. Such records must tend to raise the question whether we have here in Koṭṭhita a monk who was expert in the logic and catechetical method which afterwards came to form part of the Abhidhamma material and process, but which were in his time in all likelihood no more than the bare framework on which the third Piṭaka later came to be erected. It is tempting to see some such connection between Koṭṭhita, at least present on one occasion when there was *abhidhamma* talk or, according to the *Dīgha Commentary* being one of the two interlocutors on this occasion, and the ascription to him of such special branches of learning: logic and catechism, as form part of the stuff out of which the Abhidhamma Piṭaka was composed.

On the third occasion when the term *abhidhammakathā* occurs, two points should be noticed: first, that it is unique to find *abhidhamma* in juxtaposition with *vedalla*, a catechism on fragments or miscellaneous disconnected subjects; and secondly, that it is here also federated with the

42 Mentioned at *D.* i. 190, 199ff. as a friend of the wanderer Poṭṭhapāda. See *Dial.* i. 256, n. 1. At *DA.* 379 it is said that the talk was held between Moggallāna and Koṭṭhita.

43 Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Gotama the Man*, pp. 111, 114.

44 *D.P.P.N.* under "Citta called Hatthirohaputta" and under "Cittahatthisāriputta Sutta."

45 *Maj. Sutta* XLIII.

pair *dhamma vinaya*, doctrine and discipline. There is one other example of this latter association, to which we will turn next. Here we are concerned with *Ang.* iii. 107, where it is stated that one of the five dangers in the way of monks who are untrained in body, morals, mind and wisdom is that when they are talking *abbidhamma* talk and *vedalla* talk, entering on a "dark doctrine,"⁴⁶ they will not be awake (to the meaning, *na bujjhissanti*). The passage ends as do those for the four other "dangers", by saying, "thus from corrupt doctrine comes corrupt discipline, from corrupt discipline comes corrupt doctrine." This is the leading concern: to keep doctrine and discipline pure, and not to confuse them by ignorant talk on *abbidhamma* and *vedalla*. Yet it is hereby tacitly admitted that talk on *abbidhamma* can affect one's views of *dhamma*.

Even if it be conceded that the *vedalla* method of procedure is of some antiquity, it cannot be deduced that *abbidhamma*, when so closely associated with it, is also a word belonging to some early date. For it must be remembered that any such proximity of terms may all too easily be due to later interpolation, and thus can afford no safe guide.

The other passage where *abbidhamma* is associated with *dhamma* and *vinaya* is in the Kintisutta, *Maj.* ii. 239. This is perhaps the most illuminating extant Pīṭakan reference to *abbidhamma*. The lord is recorded to tell his disciples that they should train in the "profound-knowledge-things" (or states, conditions), *dhammā abbiññā*, taught by him. It is most interesting to find these *dhammā abbiññā* apparently having here nothing to do with⁴⁷ the five *abbiññā* of a psychic nature, with the knowledge of the destruction of the *āsavā* added as a sixth, which became collected and codified into a formula, the *chalābbiññā*, and which took complete precedence over every other possible meaning or association of *abbiññā*. For the lord, so it is said, here explained the *dhammā abbiññā* by the things helpful to enlightenment, the *bodhipakkhikadhammā*. He is not shown as using this generic term, which naturally came later into being than either its thirty-seven component parts or the seven categories under which these were classified. But he names each of these categories. When the monks have trained in these things, the lord is reputed immediately to go on to say, there may be two monks holding different views on *abbidhamma*. Those

46 *kaṇha dhamma*, cf. *Dhp.* 87, *A.* v. 253.

47 Unless we except *iddhi* which occurs both in the list of *chalābbiññā* and of *bodhipakkhikadhammā*

who had trained in the *bodhipakkhikadhammā* were to summon these in turn and get each to recognise his error. When the error is recognised as an error, then *yo dhammo yo vinayo so bhāsitaḥ*, that which is doctrine, that which is discipline, can shine forth.

Again this stands out as the major point. Further it seems as if doctrine and discipline can only shine forth after divergent views on *abhidhamma* have been composed, and as if this is a task to be done by monks who have trained in the things helpful to enlightenment, here called also profound-knowledge-things. This is what the context seems trying to say. It strongly suggests that *abhidhamma* implies the higher reaches of the training: those things helpful to enlightenment, and which at the end of his ministry the dying Gotama is found recommending to his disciples. To clear up misconceptions regarding these things is to throw light on doctrine and discipline, and even on doctrine in all its fulness, *dhammassa (c)ānu-dhamma*, a point made in the last paragraph of the Kintisutta.

It may be noted that the Vibhaṅga, one of the Abhidhamma "books", has a long analysis of the *bodhipakkhikadhammā*, thus supporting the Kintisutta's evidence that these formed part of the subject matter of *abhidhamma*.

We have now noticed two cases where *abhidhamma* stands in some relation to *vinaya*, anticipating in name if in nothing more the first and the third Piṭakas. Now in *Vin.* iv, there are two occasions where *abhidhamma* and *vinaya* are again associated. On both of these the word *dhamma* is absent, whereas in the passages we have just noted it had been present. But on both of these Vinaya occasions there is present, not only the word *vinaya*, but also *suttanta*, the word which gave its name to the second Piṭaka. These passages are at *Vin.* iv. 144 (Monks' Pācittiya lxxii) and *Vin.* iv. 344 (Nuns' Pācittiya XCV). Both are cited by the Atthasālinī to show that *abhidhamma* is the lord's word.¹⁸

In the former, these three terms, *vinaya*, *suttanta*, *abhidhamma*, are also associated with *gāthā*, songs, poems, metric verses. This quarter is unique in Pali canonical literature. A monk may say to another: "Master *suttantas* or verses (both plural) or *abhidhamma* (singular) and afterwards you will master discipline." The very presence of the word "verses" is enough to preclude the word *abhidhamma* from standing for the literary

exegesis of that name. Indeed no reference to the three Piṭakas as such would have combined a reference to part of the material, verses, which one of them eventually came to include.

The reference to *gāthā* no doubt points to a time subsequent to the composition of at any rate some of these. But again we are in ignorance of much of the history of Pali Buddhist verse-making. Yet the evidence which has been adduced from its study,⁴⁹ and it is by no means negligible, shows it must have taken a long time for say the Dhammapada, Suttanipāta, and the Verses of the Elders and the Women Elders to reach their final form. So that Oldenberg may be substantially right when he says that *gāthā* are "here meant to represent the different texts comprised in the Khuddakanikāya."⁵⁰ Only we must qualify this view by saying: "texts which came at some later date to be comprised in the Khuddakanikāya at its final revision." For with verses being made since very early days, there is no reason to infer that the "verses" or songs mentioned at *Vin.* iv. 144 are meant to refer to any completed collection or collections of verses. It is therefore not possible to conclude that the presence of this word suggests such a late date for this passage as to justify seeing here in *abhidhamma* the title of the third Piṭaka, in spite of its proximity to words which were used as titles for the two earlier Piṭakas.

Moreover this Pācittiya purports to refer to the time when Upāli, the great Vinaya expert, was alive. But since he could not have long survived the First Council, in the Vinaya accounts of which there is no mention of the Abhidhamma, this as a Piṭaka could not well have been compiled and completed until after his death.

The triad found in Nuns' Pācittiya xcv, *suttanta vinaya abhidhamma*, stands as a perfect triad without the addition of any fourth member. This is, so far as I know, with the exception of a line of verse in the admittedly later Parivāra,⁵¹ unique in Pali canonical literature. A nun, according to this Pācittiya, having obtained a monk's permission to ask him about *suttanta*, commits an offence of expiation if she asks him instead about *vinaya* or *abhidhamma*; and it is the same with the two variations on this theme. Oldenberg states that this is "the only passage in the Vinaya

49 See Introductions by Max Müller, *Dhammapada* (S.B.F. X); Chalmers, *Buddha's Teachings* (*Suttanipāta*, H.O.S. 37); Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Dhammapada* (S.B.B. vii), and her *Poems by Monk and Nun*, *Review of Religion*, January, 1940.

50 *Vinayapitakam*, vol. i. Intr. p. xii, n. 2.

51 *Vin.* v. 86.

which really presupposes the existence of an Abhidhamma Piṭaka,⁵² and that "we can unhesitatingly assume" these words to be an interpolation. Which exact "words" he means is not quite clear, since he only italicises *abhidhamma*. But he probably means no more than *abhidhamma vā*.

Although I think that Oldenberg is very likely indeed to be right, and there is no internal evidence to suggest that he is wrong, or indeed to suggest anything helpful at all, I cannot feel myself so entirely convinced as he appears to be that the Abhidhamma Piṭaka was in existence by the time that this passage was formulated. The main reason why I think he may be right is that here we have a triad, unadulterated and unique in the canon, which supplies the names of what, at some time, came to be constituted as the three Piṭakas. Where *abhidhamma* is combined with *abhiwinaya* we can be far less certain of its having this reference, indeed fairly certain that it has not. But where, as in this Pācittiya, *abhidhamma* is so closely associated with *vinaya* and with *suttanta*, but with nothing else, then an assumption such as Oldenberg's gains in plausibility.

On the other hand, although it is true that in the Nuns' Pācittiya group, Pāc. xcv is the last but one of the rules there formulated, we should not be too much swayed by this consideration. For the position of a rule in the class in which it is placed is no sure guide to its comparative date. For example, in the Monks' Pācittiya group, some of the rules towards the end have a much earlier ring than some of those which precede them and which assume the existence of certain constitutional developments, such as could only have arisen when the Order had attained some degree of long-standing. In a word, it may be said that the rules are not now arranged in the order in which they were promulgated, and they thus yield no reliable evidence for the history of their formulation.

Again, it cannot be too often emphasised, as Max Muller wrote several years ago,⁵³ that the "three-subjects of Dhamma (sutta), Vinaya and Abhidhamma treated in these baskets" (of the Suttas, of Vinaya and of Abhidhamma) "existed and were taught long before the three baskets were definitely arranged." Bearing this in mind, it may be suggested that at the time when this Pācittiya was formulated the whole teaching had done no more than reach a stage when it was *capable* of division into these three

52 *Vinayapitakam*, vol. i. Intr. p. xii. n. 2.

53 *Dhammapada* (S.B.E. X) 2nd edn., Intr. p. xli.

baskets, but that the final division and arrangement had not as yet been made.

We therefore find ourselves in great uncertainty as to what in any of the Piṭakan passages that we have noticed is the meaning and intention of the word *abhidhamma*. This word, held as it is, not to refer to the Piṭaka of that name, and with the one possible exception this seems the only tenable hypothesis, commands no unanimity of interpretation in the Commentaries. I think we may agree that the word, if not as puzzling to the commentators as to ourselves, had for them a fluctuating meaning, and was thus able to be explained in one way in one passage and in another way in another passage.

We have now found records where Moggallāna, Mahākoṭṭhita, Cittahatthisāriputta and "several elders" were concerned with *abhidhamma* talk, *abbidhanimakathā*, and once (*Āṅg* iii. 107) the word is put into the lord's mouth. Again, *abhidhamma* itself is connected with Sāriputta, on other occasions the lord is made responsible for using this word, while on still others it occurs in the Vinaya apparatus. It is perhaps not insignificant that the compound *abbidhanimakathā* is connected with the names of some of Gotama's earliest disciples. Although Moggallāna is chiefly famed for his psychic powers, and there is little reason to suppose him to have had gifts of an *abhidhamma* nature or we should have heard more about them, there is doubtless some excuse for connecting the term with Mahākoṭṭhita, as explained above, with Sāriputta on the grounds of his taking part with Koṭṭhita in the catechetical discussion now preserved in the Mahāvedallasutta, and with Cittahatthisāriputta. Very little has survived concerning this disciple. But he is shown in the Poṭṭhapāda Suttanta as sitting by while the wanderer Poṭṭhapāda and Gotama discuss aspects of the self, *attā*, then as asking a penetrating question about the three modes of self, past, present and future, and then as resolving this question in a manner approved by Gotama. Eschatological matters, such as are foreshadowed in the Poṭṭhapāda Suttanta, were later analysed in some of the Abhidhamma "books."

On the other hand the linking to these names of the term *abhidhamma* may have no foundation in fact, but may be due to the desire of "editors", working years later on the Sayings, to give the term the value they felt was owing to it on account of a growth in their day of a vogue for studying an *abhidhamma* class of thought. Conversely, this class of thought would

also gain in repute if it could be made to trace its beginnings to some of the more eminent personalities in the Order.

Of one thing we may be certain, and it is that *abhidhamma* was never meant to oust *dhamma* from its pre-eminent position. This remained immeasurably the more central and the more potent word and concept of the two. *Abhidhamma* is nowhere extolled as a prize of learning bringing its own rewards, and only to be mastered by the greatest intellects. Rather it appears as accessory material to *dhamma*, supplementary to it, illuminating it, it is true, but not necessary for those who will become, if they are willing to train, highest in the immortal because they live having *dhamma* as light, *dhamma* as refuge.⁵⁴

I. B. HORNER

Revival of Maratha Power in the North

(1761-1769)

Although historians are not agreed as to the *ultimate* effects of the battle of Panipat on the destiny of the Marathas, there is no doubt that its *immediate* result was the eclipse of Maratha power in the North. Sir Jadunath Sarkar observes that the annihilation of the Maratha armies was followed by "a revolt against Deccani domination everywhere in Hindusthan,—in the Gangetic Doab, Bundelkhand, Rajputana and Malwa alike. Everywhere the dispossessed or humbled original chieftains, and even petty landlords, raised their heads and talked of shutting the southern invaders out of their country in future."¹ Contemporary Marathi letters give a graphic picture of the disturbances which followed the dissolution of Maratha authority in those regions. The Doab was looted by bold zemindars. The roads became unsafe. Bundela chiefs like Hindupat and Khet Sing renounced Maratha allegiance. Petty chieftains created trouble in Jhansi. In Rajputana all the chiefs turned against the Marathas. Maratha officers repeatedly asked for assistance.² Nor was the anti-Maratha movement confined to humble chieftains. Shuja-ud-daula was casting a covetous eye upon Bundelkhand. The Rohillas were trying to expel the Marathas from the Doab. Madho Singh of Jaipur stopped payment to the Marathas and invaded their territory.³ Najib Khan, the principal cause of the Maratha disaster at Panipat, became the *Mir Bakshi* of the imperial army, the *Faujdar* of Delhi and the *Mukhtar* of the imperial administration. Surajmal Jat, freed alike from the Marathas and the Durranis, extended his possessions at the cost of the Marathas, the Durranis and the Rajputs. Only Ahmed Shah Abdali was inclined to be friendly, but his attempt to conclude peace with the Peshwa failed due to the intrigue of Inad-ul-mulk and Tatyā Gangadhar (Holkar's diwan).⁴

For some years the Marathas found it impossible to resume their activities in the North. After the battle of Panipat the insolvent Poonā Government created serious discontent by trying to lay violent hands upon

1 Sarkar, *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. II, pp. 502-503.

2 *Selections from Peshwa Daftar=SPD.*, xxix, 5, 6, 7, 12, 14, 15, 24, 25, 81.

3 *SPD.*, xxix, 5, 10, 18, 21, 22, 24.

4 Sarkar, *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. II, pp. 378-381, 444-445.

the property of the generals who had fallen at that fatal field.⁵ The premature death of Peshwa Balaji Baji Rao in June, 1761, "contributed to increase the general gloom which overhung the country."⁶ Then followed the family quarrels arising out of the question of succession to Jankoji Sindhia. The intrigues and rebellions of Raghunath Rao, the revolt of Janoji Bhonsle, the invasions of the Nizam and the long struggle with Haidar Ali naturally kept the Marathas away from the stormy North. It was only towards the close of his brief but glorious administration that Madhav Rao found it possible to make a serious and successful attempt to recover Maratha authority in Hindusthan.

The task of restoring Maratha authority in Rajputana and Malwa immediately after Panipat fell upon Malhar Rao Holkar. In May, 1761, a Maratha officer recaptured Ranipura (in Malwa), a place in Malhar's *jagir*, from a Candrawat Zemindar who had seized it.⁷ In June Malhar himself captured Gagrani* (in Malwa) from Abhay Singh Rathor, an officer of the Maha Rao of Kota.⁸ He then turned his attention to Madho Singh, who had been trying to set up an anti-Maratha coalition consisting of Najib Khan, Yaqub Ali (Ahmad Shah Abdali's agent in Delhi) and the exiled Emperor Shah Alam II. He was also joined, or likely to be joined, by petty Rajput chiefs, like the rulers of Sopar, Bundi, Kota, Kerauli and Khichi. Malhar could not deal with this menace during the rainy season of 1761; so he returned to Indore. In following October Madho Singh sent 10,000 troops to besiege Nerve, which was at that time held by a Maratha officer named Sadashiv Gopal. Malhar left Indore and was joined at Bariya (in Kota State) by 3,000 Kota troops led by Zalim Singh. He defeated the Jaipur army in the battle of Mangrol (November 29, 1761).¹⁰ This decisive victory destroyed Madho Singh's fond hope of uprooting Maratha power from the North and "restored Maratha prestige throughout Hindusthan."¹¹ He fled

5 Sarkar, *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. II, p. 503.

6 Grant Duff, vol. II, chap. V.

7 SPD., xxvii, 271

8 Or Ganguri, 120 miles north of Indore.

9 SPD., xxvii, 267, 269, 271

10 SPD., II, 5, 6, 57; xxi, 91-94; xxvii, 276, xxix, 20, 22, 27.

For a detailed description of the battle, see Sarkar's *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. II, pp. 506-508. Tod's account of the battle (*Rajasthan, Annals of Haravati*, chap. vi) is, as Sir Jadunath Sarkar shows, quite unacceptable.

Mangrol lies on the east bank of the river Banganga (35 miles north-east-east of Kota).

11 Sarkar, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 508.

to Jaipur, took measures for the defence of the capital against the apprehended Maratha attack, and removed his family to Amber for safety. His diwan Kaniram opened negotiations with Malhar, who had in the meanwhile come to Manoharpur (40 miles north of Jaipur). Jaipur was temporarily saved from Holkar's incursion as his attention was diverted due to the invasion of Bundelkhand by Shah Alam II and Shuja-ud-daula.¹²

Emperor Alamgir II was assassinated on November 29, 1759. His eldest son, Shah Alam, "a homeless wanderer on the face of the earth", celebrated his accession in his camp at Ghotauli (5 miles north of Sone East Bank Railway Station) on December 23. After the battle of Panipat Shuja-ud-daula undertook to escort him to Delhi. The Emperor met Shuja at Sarai Sayyid Razi on June 19 and the two reached Jajmau on July 23. After the rainy season they started for the expulsion of the Marathas from Bundelkhand.¹³ The weakness of the Marathas, the disobedience of the local chiefs and the treason of Maratha officers like Ganesh Sambhaji (who joined the Imperial army)¹⁴ made it easy for Shah Alam and Shuja to conquer a portion of Bundelkhand. Shuja crossed the Jamuna at Kalpi (Jalaun district, U.P.) in January, 1762. Within a month he captured Kalpi, Moth (Jhansi district, U.P.) and Jhansi.¹⁵ The Bundela chiefs of Urechha and Datta made peace by paying tribute. Shuja, however, failed to subjugate Raja Hindupat of Mahoba (Hamirpur district, U.P.). He then crossed the Jamuna and returned to his own dominions.¹⁶

Unable to resist this invasion the Maratha officers in Bundelkhand had appealed for assistance to Malhar Rao. He was, therefore, compelled to leave Jaipur and started for Jhansi. On his way he heard that Jhansi already fallen. So he turned back and went to Indore. He had received a serious wound at Mangrol. It made him very weak and almost confined him to bed for three months.¹⁷ His return to own territories saved Madho Singh and left the Marathas defenceless in the North.

While Malhar was trying to crush Madho Singh and his allies, other Maratha *sardars* were busy in north Malwa: Vithal Shivdev restored Maratha authority in Gohod and the neighbouring districts. There were

12 Sarkar, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 508-509.

13 *Ibid.*, pp. 525, 537, 543.

14 *SPD.*, xxix, 22, 37, 45, 46.

15 *SPD.*, xxix, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38. *Seir Mutaqberia*, (R. Cambray's edition), vol. IV, p. 25.

16 Sarkar, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 544, 509.

17 *SPD.*, II, 7; xxix, 33, 34, 37.

troubles in Ahirwada. Gopal Rao suppressed them during the early months of 1761, but soon after his departure the Ahirs rose again in alliance with Izzat Khan and the Khichis. Nothing could be done during the rainy season. In November, 1761, Maratha officers in Ahirwada invited Malhar to come to their assistance. He came as far as Sanganer, but his wound prevented him from advancing to the scene of action. Vishwas Rao was thereupon asked by his father, Naro Shankar, to capture Jhansi with the co-operation of Izzat Khan and Govind Kalyan. The latter was asked by the Poona Government to settle the affairs of Ahirwada and to recover the fort of Bhilsa, seized by the Nawab of Bhopal.¹⁸

During the years 1762-1763 the Marathas could pay no attention to the affairs of Malwa, Bundelkhand and Rajputana. The invasion of Nizam Ali and the civil war between the Peshwa and his uncle absorbed their energy. Malhar Rao, gradually sinking due to old age and ill health, could not venture into the scene of his former triumphs. Mahadji Sindhia was busy with the question of succession, and the Poona Government as yet showed no desire to profit by his abilities.¹⁹ "Inactivity and lack of a vigorous policy weakened the Maratha power in Malwa."²⁰

Two incidents seem to show that by the year 1764 the position of the Marathas in Northern India had somewhat improved. Ahmad Shah Abdali ratified a formal peace with them in that year.²¹ This was a much-needed relief,²² and at the same time it was an indirect recognition of their still surviving power. The second incident is more interesting. We read in the East India Company's general letter to Madras, dated May 13, 1768, "When our servants after the Battle of Buxur planned the extirpation of Shujah from his dominions and the giving the same up to the King,"²³ Lord Clive soon discerned the King would have been unable to maintain them and that it would have destroyed the strongest barrier against the Marathas and the northern powers and therefore wisely restored Shujah to his dominions.²⁴ If Lord Clive considered it necessary in 1764 to maintain a strong

18 *SPD.*, xxix, 12, 22, 37, 43; xxxix, 3. Rajwade, 1, 296

19 When he left Poona for Malwa in 1764, measures were taken to intercept his journey. *SPD.*, xxix, 62, 64, 67.

20 R. Sinh, *Malwa in Transition*, p. 316. 21 *SPD.*, xxix, Introduction, p. 1.

22 See the story of Raghunath Rao's flight in 1767 on pp. 8-9.

23 Shah Alam.

24 *BSCP.*, December 13, 1768. Madras to Bengal, November 11, 1768.

barrier against the Marathas, their prospects in Hindusthan must have been favourable indeed.

In 1764 the political condition of Rajputana was disturbed by the outbreak of a quarrel between Madho Singh and the Jat Rajah Jawahir Singh. Madho Singh naturally allied himself with Najib Khan, the arch-enemy of the Jats. In October, 1764, Malhar Holkar came to Jobner (13 miles east of Sambhar) in order to compel Madho Singh to clear his dues. Then he proceeded, in response to advice from Poona, to assist Jawahir Singh against Najib Khan.²⁵ But Malhar had no intention of seriously weakening his 'foster son', and his lukewarmness compelled the Jat chief to make peace with Najib in February, 1765.²⁶ Malhar's next adventure was directed against the East India Company. He met the English at Kora on May 3, 1765, as an ally of Shuja-ud-daula,²⁷ but he was defeated by Sir Robert Fletcher and compelled to fly.²⁸ Then he recovered Jhansi (December, 1765),²⁹ resumed his operations against the Rana of Gohad and hastened a rupture with Jawahir Singh. Before bringing these operations to a satisfactory conclusion he died on May 26, 1766. His alliance with the Jat Rajah had one good effect, for it intimidated Madho Singh, who agreed to make a satisfactory arrangement for the payment of his tribute. He paid five lakhs in cash, and issued orders on bankers for the balance. Mahadji Sindhia, who had in the meanwhile come to Northern India, adopted a less conciliatory policy than Holkar and pressed Madho Singh for arrears.³⁰

The annual subsidy promised by the Rana of Udaipur to Peshwa Baji Rao in 1736 was never regularly paid. During the years 1761-1764 complications in the Deccan, Malwa and Jaipur prevented the Marathas from making any attempt to put pressure on that prince. In July, 1765, Mahadji Sindhia settled the tribute of Kota at 15 lakhs, and left his Diwan Acyut

25 *SPD.*, xxix, 72. *Seir Mutaqherin* (R. Cambray's edition, vol. IV, p. 33) says that Jawahir Singh took the Marathas into his pay.

26 Grant Duff (vol. II, chap. VII) says that Najib, "by means of that secret understanding which always subsisted between him and Holkar, induced the Marathas to abandon the alliance."

27 Probably Malhar was bribed. *CPC.*, I, No. 2348, 2524A.

28 General Carnac wrote to the Select Committee of Bengal that Holkar's defeat had filled the neighbouring states with consternation. *BSCP.*, 1765(I), pp. 130-131.

29 *SPD.*, xxix, 102.

30 *SPD.*, xxix, 99, 102, 107, 108.

Rao to collect tribute from Udaipur, Shahpura and Rupnagar.³¹ Rana Ari Singh II of Udaipur agreed to pay a total sum of Rs. 26,30,221, which was to be realised in quarterly instalments in four years.³²

We have already referred to Malhar Holkar's rupture with Jawahir Singh. The Jat Rajah had become so angry at Malhar's collusion with Najib Khan that on the conclusion of peace he refused to pay the balance of 12 lakhs still due out of the promised 22 lakhs.³³ The outbreak of a civil war in the Jat State provided a welcome opportunity to the Marathas. Nahar Singh, Suraj Mal's beloved son and Jawahir's disappointed rival for the throne, renewed his claim to succession under Malhar's protection. The Marathas knew that there was in India no other place for money like Bharatpur,³⁴ and they gladly prepared themselves to play the same mercenary part in this fratricidal struggle as they had played in the case of Jaipur. A detachment of 15,000 horse was sent by Malhar (who was then fighting against the Jat Rana of Gohad) to plunder Jat villages on the other side of the Chambal. Jawahir came to an understanding with the Sikhs³⁵ and met Holkar's detachment near Dholpur in March, 1766. The combined Jat-Sikh army defeated the Marathas and captured their commanders. Dholpur, which was the appanage of Nahar Singh, was occupied by Jawahir.³⁶ The captured Maratha generals were released in December next by a treaty concluded by Naro Shankar. Jawahir could have crossed the Chambal and defeated Malhar himself but for the refusal of his Sikh horsemen to follow him in the terrible summer heat. Nahar Singh was abandoned by the Marathas and committed suicide.³⁷

Towards the close of 1765 Raghunath Rao made preparations for leading an expedition to the North.³⁸ He advanced to Malwa, took tribute from Bhopal,³⁹ and was joined by Malhar Holkar and Mahadji Sindhia near Bhandar in April, 1766.⁴⁰ Malhar died a month later. Raghunath

31 SPD., xxix, 87, 96, 99, 102, 105, 108.

32 Vad, vol. ix, pp. 266-269. Tod says that in 1764 Malhar Holkar invaded Mewar and compelled the Rana to agree to pay 51 lakhs. This is inaccurate. See Sarkar, *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. II, pp. 517-518.

33 Sarkar, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 468.

34 SPD., xxix, 177.

35 SPD., xxix, 102.

36 SPD., xxix, 126, 127, 204.

37 Sarkar, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 472-473.

38 SPD., xxix, 97.

39 SPD., xix, 36; xxix, 120, 128.

40 SPD., xxix, 131, 136, 137, 139, 140.

tried to finish the contest begun by him against Gohad.⁴¹ The misunderstanding which had arisen between Raghunath and Mahadji Sindhia over the question of succession to the Sindhia State rendered it impossible for them to work in sincere co-operation.⁴² Moreover, the Rana of Gohad was being assisted openly by the victorious Jawahir Singh. Raghunath laid siege to Gohad, but at every stage he was confronted with difficulties. His supplies were looted, and his troops starved. He had no money with him, and no loan was available even at high interest.⁴³ Some Maratha chiefs, including Holkar and Garkwad, left the camp against Raghunath's orders. Jawahir Singh encamped on the other side of the Chambal with 15,000 or 20,000 troops.⁴⁴ Yet Raghunath tried to capture Gohad by assault. He personally stood behind the batteries. The attack was repulsed, and many Maratha troops were killed. The Gohad troops came out and burnt Maratha flags. Two more attacks were repulsed, and the Maratha cause appeared hopeless. The following interesting account of the operations occurs in a letter⁴⁵ written by the Rana of Gohad to the Governor of Bengal, "Malhar for years kept on ruining my country, destroying forts and plundering ryots. Raghu Nath Rao, with a powerful army and artillery invaded my country, and having destroyed the forts situated on the frontiers, laid siege to Gohad, which is the writer's capital and birth place. The writer, taking courage, came out of the fort with 25,000 foot and 4,000 horse and at a distance of one quarter mile from the fort engaged Raghu Nath Rao. The battle lasted till sunset, when the writer entrenched himself outside the Fort. The siege went on, and day and night battles were fought in which thousands were killed. As God was on the writer's side, he offered a stubborn resistance to Raghu Nath Rao. The latter, who considered himself mightier than the Hand of Destiny, after five months

41 For the history of this principality, see Khare, vol. II, p. 1242.

42 According to *Holkar Kafiya* and *Natu's Life of Mahadji Sindhia*, Raghunath's plan of attack was betrayed to the Rana of Gohad by Mahadji. Khare disbelieves this story, as it does not occur in *Patwardhan Daftar*. There we find that Mahadji lent his troops and showed personal valour, for which Raghunath gave him a new *jagir* worth 10 lakhs. See Khare, vol. III, p. 1242.

43 See *SPD.*, xix, 44. The Peshwa sent one lakh of rupees. Khare, III, 638.

44 It seems that "the discovery of a treasonable collusion of his valued Gosain generals with the Marathas" prevented him from taking a more aggressive attitude. Sarkar, *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. II, p. 473.

45 CPC., II.

became hopeless of success and raised the siege." Then at Mahadji Sindhia's mediation the Rana agreed to pay 15 lakhs and the siege was withdrawn in December, 1766.⁴⁶ Raghunath then intended to proceed against Jawahir Singh, who, however, concluded peace⁴⁷ by surrendering the Maratha commanders captured in March, 1766. A meeting arranged between Raghunath and the Jat Rajah was ineffective owing to the former's suspicion of his Gosain generals who had taken shelter with the Maratha.⁴⁸

At this stage a revival of the Abdali menace led Raghunath to retrace his steps to the Deccan.⁴⁹ It seems that after the settlement with Jawahir Singh he intended to proceed towards Rajputana. We are told that Madho Singh collected troops and made preparations to resist the Marathas at Dasak where they usually crossed the river. The Jaipur ruler was probably alarmed at the report that "Raghunath will insist on strict payments on the Rajput country as he has in his possession the valuation of the rents."⁵⁰ But Raghunath's plan remained unexecuted. Ahmed Shah, Abdali had in the meanwhile appeared in the Punjab and "written to Raghunath in a proud and haughty manner threatening him with war and rapine."⁵¹ The Maratha chief considered it imprudent to meet him and hurriedly left Hindusthan. He left Bahiro Anant and Vithal Shivdev in Bundelkhand and proceeded to Indore *via* Ujjain. In vain did Shuja-ud-daula and the English ask him to remain where he was. Shuja sent an envoy to bring

46 Khair, III, 634, 635, 638, 644, pp. 1242-1244. *SPD.*, xxix, 160. *CPC.*, II, 11B, 12B. Grant Duff (vol. II, chap. VII) says that the Rana agreed to pay 3 lakhs only.

47 *SPD.*, xxix, 159. *CPC.*, II, 12A, 12B. One of the terms of the peace was as follows:—"A small part of country inhabited by Rajputs had for a considerable length of time belonged to the Marhattas, and they accordingly received stipulated quit-rents from the inhabitants. But for some years past the latter have not paid any rents and have been living upon plunder and rapine. Their places of abode being almost inaccessible, whenever they suspected an attack from the Marathas, they immediately crossed the river into Jawahir Singh's territories, nor could they ever be so reduced as to pay the most trifling sum. On this consideration, Raghunath Rao has agreed to a cession of that territory and granted *sanads* for that purpose to Jawahir Singh, as it lies contiguous to the latter's possessions. Jawahir Singh is to collect and receive the rents of the same exclusively and independently of any other power. It is said that he has agreed to pay for that country five lakhs of rupees; and as a compensation for the ravages committed there, Raghunath Rao is to receive the sum of ten lakhs from Malhar Rao."

48 *SPD.*, xxix, 164. *CPC.*, II, 12C.

49 *BSCP.*, 1767(1), pp. 391-392.

50 *CPC.*, II, 12B.

51 *CPC.*, II, 207.

him back, but "he pleaded rains and went home." The disappointed Nawab wrote to the Peshwa, "If he had come, what might had he not done with help from the English and myself?"⁵² The Governor of Bengal wrote to Raghunath that he was prepared, in alliance with the Nawab of Oudh, to support the Marathas against Ahmed Shah Abdali, and asked him to return to the North "lest Abdali should think he was running away to the Deccan in fear."⁵³ Nana Fadnis wrote from Poona to Shuja-ud-daula and the Governor of Bengal asking for a defensive alliance against Abdali.⁵⁴ Nothing, however, could bring Raghunath back to the North.⁵⁵ Within a short time Ahmad Shah wrote to him that he had no intentions against the Marathas and was resolved to march directly to Patna.⁵⁶ Then he returned to Lahore to punish the Sikhs,⁵⁷ leaving the Marathas free to prosecute their operations—an opportunity which Raghunath did not utilise.

Raghunath's motive in going to Indore was to settle the question of succession to Malhar Holkar's state. Malhar's successor, Male Rao, died early in 1767,⁵⁸ without leaving any issue. Gangadhar Yashwant Candrad, an old minister of the Holkar State,⁵⁹ was a partisan of Raghunath. They decided that Ahalya Bai, Male Rao's mother, should adopt a child related to the Holkar family and leave the management of affairs to the minister.⁶⁰ Ahalya Bai refused to accept this arrangement, and enlisted the support of some military chiefs and their troops. When Raghunath "was making preparations to compel her to compliance, she sent him a message, earnestly advising him not to make war on a woman, from which he might incur disgrace, but could never derive honour." Mahadji Sindhia and Janoji Bhonsle "refused to unite with him, an ungrateful

⁵² CPC., II, 622.

⁵³ CPC., II, 207.

⁵⁴ CPC., II, 224, 255.

⁵⁵ "Alliance with English and Shuja not having taken place, the Marathas marched back to save themselves"—CPC., II, 213

⁵⁶ CPC., II, 265.

⁵⁷ CPC., II, 294.

⁵⁸ Malcolm says that "his death occurred nine months after his elevation." *Memoir of Central India*, vol. I, p. 157.

⁵⁹ He "held his station of Dewan, or Minister, to the Holkar family from the Paishwah. He had been nominated by Bajerow to that office with Mulhar Rao, when the latter was first promoted to high command." *Memoir of Central India*, vol. I, p. 160.

⁶⁰ The minister proposed to give a considerable present to Raghunath. Malcolm, *Memoir of Central India*, vol. I, p. 161.

minister, to subvert the independence of the Holkar family."⁶¹ Finally, the Peshwa himself decided in favour of Ahalya Bai. She undertook the charge of civil administration and entrusted the command of her troops to Tukoji Holkar.⁶² Gangadhar was dismissed. Raghunath himself went to Mhysir, where he was "most hospitably entertained" by Ahalya Bai. "The divided authority established in the Holkar State, from the day of Tukajee's elevation, remained for above 30 years"⁶³ undisturbed by jealousy or ambition."⁶⁴

Raghunath then proceeded to Gujrat, and wrote a letter to Gopika Bai, saying that he had compelled the disloyal Gaikwad to pay a fine and to surrender some districts.⁶⁵ This letter seems to have been written to deceive Gopika Bai, for Raghunath took no steps against the Gaikwad, who was one of his partisans and helped him against the Peshwa in the civil war that followed.⁶⁶ From Gujrat Raghunath came to Anandavalli and began to collect troops for a new contest with his nephew.

Raghunath's inconclusive campaign⁶⁷ did not restore Maratha power in the North. Jawahir Singh at once became aggressive. He sent an envoy named Padre Don Pedro to Calcutta for an alliance against the Marathas, but this gentleman could not reach his destination as he was "recalled owing to an internal revolt in the Jat State."⁶⁸ Towards the close of 1767 the Jat chief's position was strong indeed. His rival Nahar Singh was dead. He had crushed his disloyal Gosain troops. Encouraged

61 Malcolm says that Ahalya Bai probably "used some of the contents of her full treasury" to gain the friendship of these chiefs. *Memoir of Central India*, vol. I, p. 121.

62 Malcolm says that he was "a chief of the same tribe, but in no way related to Mulliar Rao." *Memoir of Central India*, vol. I, p. 163. Grant Duff (vol. II, chap. VII) holds the same view.

63 Really for 28 years—till Ahalya Bai's death in 1795.

64 Malcolm, *Memoir of Central India*, vol. I, pp. 156-164. Khare, III, pp. 1229-1230, 1245-1246.

65 Khare, III, 715.

66 Khare, III, p. 1230. In a letter dated April 6, 1766, we find that Raghunath asked a man (whose name is not given) to suppress the Gaikwad. That man wrote "I am trying my best. If you come here, you will get 40 or 50 lakhs." (*SPD.*, xix, 35).

67 Mr. Sardesai says that he "woefully mismanaged" the campaign. *SPD.*, xix, Introduction.

68 *CPC.*, II, 642, 854.

by Raghunath's retreat he occupied Maratha domains from Bhind (20 miles west and south-west of Etawa) to Kalpi. Balaji Govind Kher, the Maratha officer in charge of Kalpi, was treacherously attacked and compelled to fly across the Betwa. Only Gwalior and Jhansi remained under Maratha control. The Jat Rajah established his authority in the Kalpi district, levied tribute from Datia and Seondha, advanced up to the bridge of Nawar and formed an alliance with the rulers of Pichor and Gohad.⁶⁹ In December, 1767, Jawahir won a "Pyrrhic victory" over Jaipur troops in the battle of Maonda (60 miles north of Jaipur).⁷⁰ A contemporary writer observes, "The fortune of the Jats has been shaken and the result has been fatal to them. They have returned home pillaged, stupefied and overthrown; and Jawahir has since then only gone backwards."⁷²

While the Jat chief was pursuing a policy of aggrandisement, the ambitious Nawab of Oudh had not been sitting idle. He wanted to occupy Bundelkhand and asked the Governor of Bengal to exercise British influence in his favour. The Governor recommended a policy of caution. Bundelkhand, he wrote, "is large and extensive, surrounded by Maratha districts, and favourite object of their attention. If you take it, there may be jealousy or open rupture. If Marathas go to war with you, it will be absolutely impossible for the English to help you without violating their alliance with the Marathas on the coast." So the Nawab was asked to wait, and a half-hearted assurance followed,—"The late advices from the coast indicate so little permanency to the alliance of the English with the Marathas and the Nizam, and show so much duplicity and treachery in their conduct that it is not unlikely for the alliance to be ultimately broken off."⁷² The English were obviously unwilling to venture far into the den of the Marathas even to strengthen their barrier. But Shuja-ud-daula was not to be easily set aside. He suggested that the Rohillas, Ahmad Khan Bangash and the Jats might enter into an alliance and form a barrier against the Marathas.⁷¹ The Governor of Bengal approved this plan and asked the Nawab to carry on anti-Maratha negotiations with the above powers, although the Peshwa had, "far from disturbing the English, sent a wakil with voluntary offers of co-operation against the Nizam and Haidar."⁷⁴

69 *SPD.*, xxix, 149, 185, 215, 196, 169, 207, 208.

70 *SPD.*, xxix, 192.

71 Wendel, quoted in Sarkar, *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. II, p. 479.

72 *CPC.*, II, 524.

73 *CPC.*, II, 597.

74 *CPC.*, II, 599.

Fortunately for the Marathas, their enemies were too jealous of each other to combine against them.

The temporary eclipse of Maratha influence due to Raghunath Rao's hasty retreat did not last long. Maratha officers in Bundelkhand succeeded in recapturing many posts occupied by the Jats.⁷⁵ Their position was further improved by internal dissensions in the Jat kingdom. Jawahir Singh was assassinated in July, 1768, by a soldier whom he had disgraced.⁷⁶ His successor, Ratan Singh, was murdered by a Brahmin monk⁷⁷ in April, 1769. His infant son, Kesari Singh, was then placed on the throne, the management of affairs being entrusted to Dan Shah, Nawal Singh's brother-in-law. Dan Shah seems to have been an able man, and he had already participated in some encounters against the Marathas in Bundelkhand.⁷⁸ But his authority was disputed by Nawal Singh and Ranjit Singh, Ratan Singh's brothers, who did not agree to submit to the rule of an outsider. Dan Shah was besieged by them at Dig and forced to surrender on condition of exile from the Jat kingdom. Then a quarrel broke out between Nawal Singh and Ranjit Singh. As Shah Alam wrote to the Governor of Bengal, "There is scarcely an individual (in the Jat State) whose head is not turned with ambitious schemes."⁷⁹ Ranjit Singh took possession of the fortress of Dig with all the treasures and stores hoarded there,⁸⁰ and defied his brother.

In the meanwhile the Marathas had reappeared in the North. Jawahir Singh's aggressions had led the Peshwa to decide that an army under Mahadji Sindhia and Tukoji Holkar should be sent to Hindusthan in order to deal with the growing menace of the Jats. These two chiefs, accordingly, proceeded to the North;⁸¹ but before dealing with the Jats they invaded

75 *SPD.* xxix, 75. Colonel Smith reported from Allahabad to Calcutta on October 28, 1767, that Jawahir Singh had evacuated the fort of Kalpi which had been reoccupied by the Marathas. *BSCP.*, 1767(I), pp. 409-410; 1767(II), pp. 386-387.

76 *SPD.*, xxix, 192. *CPC.*, II, 789, 835, 1100. *See Mutaqherin* (R. Cambray's edition), vol. IV, p. 34.

77 *Seir Mutaqherin* (R. Cambray's edition), vol. IV, p. 34.

78 *SPD.*, xxix, 173, 202, 215, 217, 220, 222, 223. 79 *CPC.*, II, 1101.

80 *Seir Mutaqherin* (R. Cambray's edition), vol. IV, p. 34.

81 Colonel Smith reported from Allahabad to Calcutta on December 1, 1767, that the Marathas had not yet determined to enter Hindusthan.

The following episode narrated by Grant Duff (vol. II, chap. VII) shows how the young Peshwa exacted obedience from his servants: "When ordered to

Mewar. Rana Ari Singh II had offended many powerful nobles of his court, who had thereupon set up a rival for the throne in the person of Ratan Singh, falsely reputed to be a son of Rana Raj Singh II. In May, 1769, Mahadji Sindhia and Tukoji Holkar appeared near Udaipur to support the cause of Ratan Singh. Differences, however, soon arose between the two chiefs, as a result of which Holkar returned to Kota in June. Mahadji once decided to give up the cause of Ratan Singh, who had no money, and to support Ari Singh who was prepared to pay 35 lakhs. But he remained idle and took no steps to deliver an assault on Udaipur. At last Ari Singh agreed to pay 64 lakhs as contribution and 5 lakhs as present to Sindhia, and to alienate $1\frac{1}{4}$ lakhs worth of *jagir* in favour of Ratan Singh. 33 lakhs were paid immediately; for the balance some districts were left to be jointly administered by Rajput and Maratha officers.⁸²

On his return from Mewar Tukoji Holkar besieged Raghogarh.⁸³ Sindhia joined him after the conclusion of peace with Ari Singh. Then they advanced to the Kerauli territory in order to put pressure for tribute on Jaipur.⁸⁴ Before this purpose could be accomplished, they were lured away by the envoys of Ranjit Singh to take part in the civil war which was then desolating the Jat kingdom.

ANIL CHANDRA BANERJEE

Hindoostan.....after all the commanders had obtained their audience of leave, Mahadajee Sindhia.....continued to loiter in the neighbourhood of Poona. Mandoo Rao, who at all times exacted strict obedience from his officers,.....observed Sindhia's camp still standing. He sent instantly to Mahadajee Sindhia, expressing astonishment at his disobedience.....and presumption.....Mahadajee took his departure promptly."

82 *SPD.*, xxix, 87 (wrong date?), 233, 234, 238, 239, 241, 243, 245. The Rajput version is different. See Tod, *Annals of Mewar*, chap. XVI, and Ojha, *Rajputāne Kā Itihās*, part III, pp. 962-867.

83 *SPD.*, xxix, 245.

84 *CPC.*, III, 128.

[Abbreviations used:—

SPD.—Sardesai's *Selections from the Peshwa Daftar*.

Khare—Khare's *Aitabasik Lekha Sangraha*.

CPC.—*Calendar of Persian Correspondence*.

Numbers of letters, *not* pages, are referred to.

Vad—Peshwas' Diaries.

BSCP.—Bengal Select Committee Proceedings.]

Some Anglo-French Disputes in Bengal during Post-Diwany Period

The Anglo-French relations in Bengal during the post-diwany period were none too cordial, and were marked by continual jealousies and disputes. The authorities at Chandernagore envied the political ascendancy of their English rivals, and fretted against the increasing restriction of their own freedom and trade. The English on the other hand suspected secret and hostile designs on the part of their disgruntled neighbours, and were ever on the alert, lest the latter should seriously attempt to disturb the peace and tranquility of the country.

The French authorities complained of interruption to their trade soon after the departure of Clive.¹ Towards the end of March, 1767,² they sent a deputation to Calcutta to acquaint Verelst with their manifold grievances.³ Messrs. Sinfray and Rouland, deputies from the Council of Chandernagore, represented, firstly, that the customs officials had lately begun to detain and search their boats at every *Chauki*, causing thereby unnecessary delay as well as expense, secondly, that the English *Gumashtahs* abused their influence, and deliberately obstructed the French trade, thirdly, that the weavers were not allowed to work for the French Company, and lastly, that the officials of the '*Nizamat*' often disregarded the privileges of the French Company, and refused to do justice.⁵

In reply to the remonstrance of the deputation, the Governor pointed out⁶ that the boats of the European Companies had always been detained at every recognised *chauki*, and were also liable to be searched, if full particulars of the goods were not stated in the *dastaks*. He further explained that no new duties had been imposed on the French goods, and that the

1 Beng. Pub. Cons., February 2, 1767.

2 Letter to Court, March 30, 1767.

3 Beng. Pub. Cons., March 30, 1767.

4 *Vide* "Remonstrance" of Messrs Sinfray and Rouland, March 24, 1767.

5 Cop. I, 1766-67, Nos. 135-7. The Faujdar of Hooghly was, for instance, reported to have summoned a French subject to attend his court at Hooghly. "This," the French authorities complained, "is unjust and means a violation of the privileges the French have been enjoying for a long time."

6 Letter to the Council of Chandernagore, March 27, 1767.

customs regulations were the same for all classes of merchants including the English who too had to pay the usual duties and allow their boats to be searched, if necessary. As regards the complaints of highhandedness on the part of the Company's *gumashtahs* and the Nawab's officials, the Governor readily agreed to make necessary enquiries and redress "every real grievance," and finally assured the deputation that he had already issued instructions⁷ to the English *gumashtahs* and the Nizamat officials not to impede the trade of the French Company, or give them any reasonable cause for offence.⁸

The principal grievance⁹ of the French was, however, their want of a sufficient number of weavers, which was admittedly¹⁰ caused by the recent enlargement of the English investment in silk goods. This is why both the French and the Dutch pressed for an equitable division¹¹ or 'enumeration' of all the available weavers in different *arangs*. The Governor and Council at Chandernagore complained¹² in May that the Nabob's officials still interfered with their trade, and protested in particular against the conduct of Raja Maha¹³ Singh of Dacca, who had "sent people into the jungles to take our cloths out of the hands of the weavers whom he has forbidden to continue to work for us before the business of your nation was finished."¹⁴ The Governor in his reply to the authorities at Chandernagore maintained that complaints were "reciprocal," and that it was not possible to restrain "by violence the free-born manufacturers of the country." He, however, instructed¹⁵ the Chief at Dacca to inquire into the conduct of Raja Maha Singh and restrain¹⁶ him, if found actually guilty of the alleged highhandedness. It is interesting to note that the Governor indignantly

7 Beng. Pub. Cons., February 2, 1767. " ... we have repeated our orders that their people (i.e. the French *gumashtahs*) be not molested in any shape whatever."

8 Cop. P. L. I., 1766-67, No. 4.

9 Letter to Court, March 17, 1767. Bolts, *Considerations* etc. pp. 73, 192 etc.

10 Beng. Sel. Com., March 10, 1767. *Ibid.*, July 6, 1767. Letter to Court, March 28, 1767.

11 Beng. Pub. Cons., May 20, 1767.

12 Letter from the Governor and Council at Chandernagore, May 6, 1767.

13 In the Proceedings the name is 'Maw Sing.'

14 Letter from the Governor and Council at Chandernagore, May 15, 1767.

15 Beng. Pub. Cons., May 20, 1767.

16 "It is not in our power to remove or displace him." (Beng. Pub. Cons., *op. cit.*).

repudiated the insinuation that the acts of violence reported by the French agents were inspired by the English and challenged the French Governor to produce one single instance of their having exercised an undue influence to the prejudice of their affairs.¹⁷

The French authorities bitterly recriminated¹⁸ that the English *gumashtabs* regularly abused their authority, and managed to elude the orders issued from Calcutta. They wrote on the 27th of May, "Our complaints far from diminishing seem to multiply."¹⁹ The Governor thereupon informed them that their commissaries had already been appointed to investigate into the alleged abuses, and asked for co-operation in the enquiry now in progress. Following the example of the Dutch, the French refused²¹ to participate in the work of the aforesaid commission of inquiry, and insisted on a fair division of the weavers in the manner formerly agreed²² to by Clive. The authorities at Calcutta had, however, already decided²³ not to allow the proposed division of weavers. They accordingly informed the French in July²⁴ that upon maturely weighing the matter and taking the advice of the ministry" they had been convinced of "the impracticability and ill consequence" of a division of weavers among the European Companies.

Meanwhile an incident²⁵ had occurred at Patna, which would serve to illustrate how commercial rivalry not infrequently led to acts of aggression on the part of the servants of the rival European Companies. M. Carvalho, Chief of the French Factory at Patna, complained²⁶ in May against certain English *gumashtabs* who had molested his agents and compelled "the inhabitants to sell their opium to the English", although he "had already made advances" for the same. As, Shitab Ray "would not

17 Letter to the Governor and Council at Chandernagore, May 20, 1767.

18 Beng. Pub. Cons., May 30, 1767.

19 Letter from the Governor and Council at Chandernagore, May, 27, 1767.

20 Letter to the Governor and Council at Chandernagore, May 30, 1767.

21 Beng. Pub. Cons., July 11, 1767.

22 Letter from the Governor and Council at Chandernagore, June 18, 1767.

23 Beng. Pub. Cons., June 8, 1767.

24 Letter to the Governor and Council at Chandernagore, July 11, 1767.

25 Beng. Pub. Cons., June 8, 1767. Letter from Mr. T. Rumbold, May 28, 1767.

26 Letter from Mons. A. Carvalho to Mr. T. Rumbold, May 18, 1767.

concern himself"²⁷ in this matter, M. Carvalho forcibly imprisoned one of the English *gumashtabs* in the French Factory.²⁸ The English *gumashtabs* on their part seized a number of French *gumashtabs* as a retaliatory measure. M. Carvalho thereupon sent a 'vakil' to represent the matter to Shitab Ray, but, according to M. Carvalho's allegation,²⁹ the vakil was assaulted by Mr. Rambold "with his own hand." The latter retorted with a different version³⁰ of the affair, and denied having ever assaulted the 'Vakil.' He alleged³¹ that before Shitab Ray could complete his enquiry into the complaints against the English *gumashtabs*, M. Carvalho had taken the law into his own hands, and had imprisoned an English *gumashtab* in the French Factory. It is noteworthy that the Governor and Council offered³² to institute a public enquiry into this affair by the members of the Patna Council in the presence of M. Carvalho, but the French authorities do not appear to have availed of this offer. A few months later, M. Carvalho was once again reported to have imprisoned an 'amil' of the Government on grounds which appeared after careful examination by Shitab Ray to be wholly untenable.³³ Although incidents such as these were no more than mere exhibition of bad temper, they served to aggravate the already strained relations, between the English and the French in Bengal.

Rivalry³⁴ in inland trade was at the root of most of the quarrels between the English and the French authorities. Early in November, Mr. Sykes, Resident at the Durbar, reported,³⁵ "Mr. Chevalier appears to me to be aiming at carrying on a trade throughout the country on the same footing that we do, and has established *gumashtabs* at many places for the purchase of rice, grain, and other articles which they never before dealt in."

27 Letter from Mons. A. Carvalho to the Governor, May 24, 1767. Beng. Pub. Cons., June 18, 1767.

28 Letter from Mr. T. Rambold to Mons. A. Carvalho, May 23, 1767.

29 Letter from Mons. A. Carvalho to Mr. T. Rambold, May 23, 1767.

30 Beng. Pub. Cons., July 11, 1767.

31 Letter from Mr. T. Rambold, June 30, 1767.

32 Letter to the Governor and Council at Chandernagore July 11, 1767.

33 Trans. R. 1767-68, No. 374.

34 Orders were issued in the name of the Nawab and Muhammad Riza Khan to the Chiefs of the French, Dutch, and Danish Factories, prohibiting their trade in salt, betelnut, and tobacco (Vide. Beng. Sel. Com., October 13, 1767). This naturally caused great heartburning among the rivals of the English.

35 Letter from Mr. F. Sykes, November 9, 1767.

Mr. Sykes accordingly warned³⁶ the authorities that unless the French were restrained immediately, they would endeavour "to undermine our trade"! The Select Committee at once took up a strong attitude, and resolved to confine the rival European Companies "to the precise bounds of their trade in imports and exports, agreeably to the letter and spirit of their phirmaund."³⁷ Mr. Sykes was instructed³⁸ to put a stop to the inland trade of the French with the assistance of the authorities³⁹ at Murshidabad.

As desired⁴⁰ by Mr. Sykes, Muhammad Riza Khan issued strict regulations⁴¹ for restraining "the illicit trade" of the Europeans. These regulations were circulated to all zamindars and officers of the Government. They were directed, firstly, to suffer only those *gumashtabs* to reside in the districts under their jurisdiction, who had regular '*parwanahs*' under the seal of the Nawab, the Company, or the Governor, secondly to prevent the *gumashtabs* from buying or selling articles which were not specified in their '*parwanahs*,' thirdly, to disallow the use of force or compulsion against the ryots or the '*gumashtabs*,' and in case of disobedience on the part of the latter to report such cases to Murshidabad, fourthly, to exert their influence and authority in the suppression of all abuses in connection with inland trade, fifthly, to seize and send those *gumashtabs* to Murshidabad, who should be found trading in salt, betelnut, tobacco, and grain in the name of the French, the Dutch, or other foreigners, sixthly, to enforce the collection of the prescribed customs duties and check all illegal charges, and lastly, to afford every encouragement and protection to the merchants and inhabitants of the country, and relieve the poor from oppression.

These regulations were of course meant to suppress the inland trade of the French and other Europeans, but it may be noted that the Governor was always ready to remove all just grievances of the latter in the matter of their recognised sea-borne trade. For example, when M. Chevalier complained⁴² that the *chaukidars* levied double duties on the French goods, the Governor promptly took action to stop such illegal exactions,

36 Letter from Mr. F. Sykes, November 10, 1767.

37 Beng. Sel. Com., November, 17, 1767.

38 Letter to Mr. F. Sykes, November 17, 1767.

39 The Nawab himself had recently asked for a prohibition of the inland trade of the Europeans. Trans. R. 1767-68, No. 381.

40 Letter from Mr. F. Sykes, November 25, 1767.

41 Beng. Sel. Com., November 29, 1767. 42 Trans. I. 1766-67, No. 203.

and directed Muhammad Riza Khan and the Faujdar of Hooghly to punish such abuses of authority on the part of the customs officials.⁴⁴ But, however much the authorities might tolerate the regular trade of the French under instructions from the Directors,⁴⁵ they would not allow their rivals to extend their inland trade on any pretence whatsoever. Early in December, the Governor issued strict orders to Muhammad Riza Khan, directing him "to confine the French Company to their fixed bounds." The Governor reminded him that it was "most unreasonable that the inland trade of the province, which the English themselves have curtailed, should still be laid open to the French."⁴⁶ Muhammad Riza Khan was thereafter so strict in his attitude towards the French that he once refused⁴⁷ to allow their agents to reside in Sylhet for manufacturing lime, lest they should set on foot an illicit trade in rice, cloth, opium, and other necessary commodities in that remote district. The malpractices of the French *gumashtabs* who, according to Mr. Sykes, often endeavoured "to assume an authority independent of the Government's officers"⁴⁸ were thus effectively checked. The French authorities were also compelled to discontinue their unlawful grant of '*dastaks*' to local merchants.⁴⁹

The extent to which the French found themselves restricted in their trade will be best judged from a highly exaggerated despatch⁵⁰ which M. Chevalier wrote on the subject to de Boigne, Minister of Marine and the Colonies, on the 6th of September, 1763. The relevant portions of the despatch may be thus freely translated: "Our privileges are no longer considered fit to be recognised. Our passports are no more valid. Our colours are insulted from all sides. Our boats are stopped and damaged and new customs duties are imposed upon us, from which we were always exempted. The end of such a revolting conduct is clear; we are going to be forced to renounce our commerce. The English know well that it would not be decent to make their name appear in these vexatious affairs. They act in the name of the Nawab, the latter is but a paid servant of theirs;

43 Trans. I. 1766-67, No. 216.

44 Letter from Court, May 17, 1766.

45 Trans. I. 1766-67, No. 219A.

46 Trans. R. 1767-68, No. 461

47 Letter to Court, September 13, 1768.

48 Letter from Mr. F. Sykes, November 25, 1767.

49 Trans. I. 1766-67, No. 223.

50 For the original despatch in French *vide*, '*Bengal Past and Present*,' vol. XVI, p. 130. Unfortunately, it has not been translated there. The above translation is the present writer's own.

constrained to act conformably to their wishes. They have recently made him publish a new decree which absolutely prohibits all branches of our trade in this country; and all Frenchmen who penetrate into these provinces for the purpose of trade are sure to be arrested and imprisoned. It is in vain that we complain and ask for justice. The English order the Nawab to perpetrate iniquities with which the latter himself is disgusted; for at the bottom of his heart he desires only to favour us. In short, the jealousy of the English has reached a point which cannot be endured. In a position like this it is certain that we have nothing more to hope for, and that we can regard India as absolutely lost to us."

In March, 1768, the Governor brought to the notice of the Select Committee that the French were transmitting large quantities of silver to Pondicherry, and as the scarcity of specie was already acute in the province, the Select Committee resolved⁵¹ to put a stop to the future exportation of bullion from Bengal. At the suggestion⁵² of Mr. Sykes, the Governor represented to the Emperor that the French, the Dutch, and other European nations brought little silver into this country, and not only carried on their trade by receiving money here and giving drafts⁵³ on their Companies at home, but also exported⁵⁴ large sums of money out of Bengal, thereby accentuating the growing scarcity⁵⁵ of coin in these provinces. To oblige the Governor, the Emperor, of course, readily issued a royal 'farman,'⁵⁶ prohibiting the export of bullion from Bengal.

51 Beng. Sel. Com., March 31, 1768.

52 Mr. Sykes complained in April, "... the Shroffs on the smallest intimation of being obliged to exchange their money have declared their intention of shutting up their shops and quitting the city..... complaints of a similar nature are made to me from many of the considerable districts."

53 It is worth noticing that the authorities wanted to use the Emperor's name to stop the export of bullion from Bengal. After all, the legal fiction of the Emperor's authority still held good.

54 The French authorities induced the Company's servants to send their remittances through them by offering more favourable terms. For example, the authorities at Calcutta informed the Directors in December, 1767, that the French had lately "reduced their exchange on bills granted on their constituents to twenty-six pence for the current rupee, or one penny lower than the exchange allowed to your servants." Letter to Court, December 16, 1767. Vide also the letters of Mr. Richard Barwell (*Bengal, Past and Present*, vol. IX, pp. 172-4).

55 Letter to Court, September, 13, 1767.

56 Siyar (Lucknow Text), p. 783.

57 Beng. Sel. Com., July 23, 1768.

The 'farman'⁵⁸ runs thus: "As the good of mankind and the welfare of countries has always been the chief study of great kings, former Emperors, out of their bounty, benevolence, and love of their subjects, were graciously pleased to grant the privilege of trade to several European nations, that they might bring here their own commodities, and in benefiting the people of this country, benefit themselves in return by exporting the manufactures of this country, and thus promote the mutual advantage of both the people. At present His fortunate and propitious Majesty has been informed that the European nations bring in a small quantity of bullion into the country and export a great quantity of coin out of it. Since these practices are the occasion of great distress to His Majesty's subjects, and disadvantageous to the Empire, paying regard therefore to the prosperity of the country and the welfare of its inhabitants, His Majesty has issued his Royal farman to all European nations that whatever quantity of bullion and merchandise they bring here, they should take its equivalent in the commodities of this country in return, and not carry with them home than the value of the bullion. They are also ordered to desist from exporting money without an order from the Nizamat. In case they act contrary thereto, they shall be caused to pay the Sarkar a penalty of double the quantity they export and forfeit the liberty of trade which former kings as well as the present were graciously pleased to grant them. It is likewise necessary that they should give in a list of the goods they export and import to the Baksh-bandar⁵⁹ that it may pass His Majesty's august cognizance. Let therefore all the world, as it regards His Majesty's high displeasure, pay due obedience to this command."

The enforcement⁶⁰ of this 'farman' gave rise to serious dispute with the French late in 1768. 'Chaukis' were stationed from Chandernagore to Hijli to search all vessels under French colours and seize whatever bullion was found in any of them.⁶¹ The French authorities bitterly protested against this new interdiction, and would not agree to have their boats and ships searched. M. Chevalier sent a strong remonstrance⁶² against "the unjust and violent proceedings" of the Faujdar of Hooghly, under whose orders all the French boats that passed down the river were detained and searched, and urged that in cases of necessity he was obliged to export

⁵⁸ The 'Farman' is dated 7th of Rabi II, 9, *Julus*.

⁵⁹ The Customs Officer at Hooghly.

⁶¹ Trans. R. 1768, No. 320.

⁶⁰ Abs. I. 1766-71, No. 148.

⁶² *Ibid*, No. 9A.

small sums of money to different settlements, adding significantly, "Every individual and merchant is master of his own property, and has the power to send it wherever he thinks proper."

In December there were serious clashes between the French and the 'Chauki' people. Once while a French boat was detained by the 'Chauki' at Chatra for the usual search, the Frenchmen on the boat violently assaulted three peons, and made off with one of the wounded men and three of the 'Chauki' boats to Serampour.⁶³ The men were forcibly carried on board and the boats were detained alongside of the French ships anchored at Serampur. A few days later, when two French boats were again stopped by the same 'Chauki' at Chatra, the crews of the boats pelted the peons with sticks and stones, wounded one of the 'dandis,' bruised many others seriously, and continued to act in this manner till they arrived at Serampur. The Faujdar of Hooghly complained to the Governor that if the French persisted in behaving in this outrageous manner, it would not be possible for ether 'Chaukis' to search their boats, except by taking recourse to hostilities.⁶⁴ Muhammad Riza Khan likewise represented⁶⁵ that the French would not pay heed to the royal orders, and were bent⁶⁶ upon quarrelling with "the people belonging to the Sarkar."

The obduracy of the French authorities, however, could not continue long. Muhammad Riza Khan eventually threatened strong measures against them, and warned M. Chevalier⁶⁷ that if he did not desist from exporting money from the country, the entire French trade in Bengal would be put an end to.⁶⁸ Strict orders were issued to the 'Chaukis' to search every French ship, and confiscate the money that might be found in any of them. As, however, the French still paid no regard to the repeated warnings of Muhammad Riza Khan and the Faujdar of Hooghly, orders were issued early in 1769 in the name of the Nawab for a blockade of Chandernagore. According to a contemporary account,⁶⁹ the French opened fire on the peons sent to surround the town, as a result of which many were reported to have been killed and wounded. Reprisals were

63 Trans. R. 1768, No. 333.

65 *Ibid.*, 1769, No. 3.

67 Trans R., 1769, No. 9.

69 Vide *Memoir* of Colonel Thomas Deane Pearse of the Bengal Artillery (Bengal, Past and Present, vol. II, pp. 311-12). Letter from Col. Pearse to a friend at Allahabad, February 23, 1769.

64 *Ibid.*, No. 342.

66 *Ibid.*, No. 4.

68 *Ibid.*, No. 9B.

forthwith ordered, and a free fight ensued between the Nawab's people and the French, in which the latter ultimately came off worst. A French ship was seized, a number of houses at Chandernagore were pulled down, and the French trade was practically dislocated. This appears to have brought the French authorities to their senses, for they submitted shortly afterwards, whereupon the ship was restored to them.

Among the conditions of the restoration of Chandernagore to the French after the conclusion of the Seven Years' War was that no new fortification should be constructed there in future.⁷⁰ The authorities at Calcutta were extremely strict on this point, and their most serious quarrel with the French during the post-diwani period was incidentally over a ditch excavated by the French ostensibly to provide for a proper drainage of the town of Chandernagore.

Late in 1767 the Faujdar of Hooghly reported to Muhammad Riza Khan that the French were erecting some fortifications at Chandernagore on the plea of constructing a drain round the town.⁷¹ Muhammad Riza Khan promptly sent an officer with a troop of horse,⁷² and ordered⁷³ the Faujdar to stop the progress of the ditch. While fully approving of "the spirited conduct"⁷⁴ of Muhammad Riza Khan, the Governor ordered the postponement⁷⁵ of any strong action for the present in order to make the necessary enquiries from the French Governor about the object and nature of the works under construction. In reply to Verelst's representations,⁷⁶ M. Chevalier assured the Governor towards the end of December that "the work carrying on there was only a ditch round the town with drains to carry off the water which in the rainy season makes it very unhealthy," and finally offered to have the ditch examined by an English engineer "as well for our satisfaction as for that of the country government."⁷⁷

In January, 1768, Capt. Martin, Chief Engineer, was deputed by the Governor to inspect and report on the character of the ditch in question.

70 According to Article XI of the Treaty of Paris, the French engaged "not to erect fortifications, or to keep troops, in any part of the Subah of Bengal" Vide also Gross, *Voyage to the East Indies*, II, pp 477-8.

71 Trans. R., 1768, No. 443.

72 *Ibid*, 1768, No. 445.

73 *Muzaffar Nāmah* (Alld. Univ., MS.), p. 437

74 Trans. I., 1766-67, No. 219A.

75 *Ibid.*, No. 230.

76 Letter to Court, February 29, 1768

77 Beng. Sel. Com., February 10, 1768.

Capt. Martin carefully examined the excavations and reported⁷⁸ that he could detect nothing in the works in the nature of a fortification.⁷⁹

It appears from his report that the ditch was 38 ft. broad, and from 12 to 15 ft. deep in different parts and that four hundred workmen were employed daily for this work. Capt. Martin seems to have been fully convinced that the ditch was meant only to deliver the waters which annually flooded⁸⁰ the town in the rains. The authorities thereupon decided to offer no obstruction to the work in question, and no objections were in fact raised by them for more than a year.

Early next year, however, the excavations for the ditch were reported to have assumed such proportions as to create the suspicion that they were intended to be used as defensive earthworks. The Governor accordingly directed Lieut.-Col. Campbell, Chief Engineer, to make extensive enquiries and report on the present state of the works. The latter, it is interesting to note, managed⁸¹ to inspect the ditch incognito before presenting his credentials to the French authorities.

Lieut.-Col. Campbell's report contains a vivid description of the state of the works, and deserves to be quoted in full. He wrote⁸² to Mr. Cartier⁸³ as follows: "Lest I should have been disappointed in obtaining that information which Mr. Verelst requested relative to the French Drain at Chandernagore, I thought it best upon learning at Chinsura that there was a large body of Cooleys employed upon the excavation to visit the work before I waited on M. Chevalier, and have the pleasure to acquaint you, Sir, that I succeeded so well on the undertaking as to examine the greatest part of it, before the French Governor had any intelligence of my arrival.

78 Letter from Capt. F. Martin, January 28, 1768.

79 Letter to Court, February 9, 1768. ".....Capt. Martin.....has given it as his opinion that it could not, in any degree, be deemed a fortification, or answer any other purpose than what Mr. Chevalier assured the President it was intended."

80 "Mr. Chevalier informed me that several children have been carried away.....and the houses have suffered in their foundations."

Letter from Capt. F. Martin, *op. cit.*, It was in execution of an elaborate drainage scheme that the "digue d'enciente" was excavated to take off the outflow from the drains of the town. *Vide Stavorinus, Voyage to the East Indies*, I, p. 529f.

81 Beng. Pub. Cons., May 2, 1769.

82 Letter from Lieut.-Col. Campbell, April 27, 1769.

83 The report was addressed to Mr. Cartier, as the Governor was during these days at Murshidabad in connection with the 'Punyaba.'

"I found this Ditch or Drain as the French are pleased to term it about three miles in Extent—its breadth about fifty feet in many places, and from 12 to 18 feet in depth from the top of the Rampart—the earth of the Excavation which is laid regularly on the inside of the ditch makes the Rampart 50 feet broad and about 6 or 10 feet above the level of the Country, and I found 3500 Cooleys then at work upon the excavation.

"Along the circuit of this ground as far as I placed it there seemed to be about 7 or 800 feet of the excavation not yet commenced upon, and what appears not a little remarkable in this work is that the most finished parts are those that are most distant from the Public Roads and consequently little exposed to the eye of a British Passenger.

"Their overseers differed exceedingly in their reports of the intention of this work though some of them were honest enough to call it an Entrenchment—for my part, Sir, I am perfectly of opinion it is capable of being made a good field work in a very few days, I mean those parts of it that are already carried up to the above specified dimensions, and there may be at present (as far as I can learn) two thirds of the whole circuit in that State.

"As to the precious pretext of its being a Drain to carry off the back-water of the country which inundates the Town of Chandernagore it can have little weight with Gentlemen of Common understanding who examine the Work with attention.

"The French are not remarkable for cutting zig zag drains of 50 feet broad and 12 or 13 feet deep for the sake of carrying off as much back-water as might be contained in a straight line of one sixth of the capacity, neither do I imagine it is consistent with the last articles of Peace, that they should on any pretence whatsoever shut themselves up to the field in such a manner as to render their situation formidable, but you, Sir, and the Hon'ble Council are the best judges of this matter, and it only becomes my duty to render to the Board the earliest intelligence of a circumstance wherein the interest of the Hon'ble Company may be so deeply concerned."

The report of Lieut.-Col. Campbell satisfied⁸⁴ the authorities that their suspicions were too well-grounded. They were convinced that the construction of the ditch and rampart amounted to an infraction of the 11th

article of the last Treaty of peace. They accordingly decided to depute the Chief Engineer "in a public capacity" "to make the most minute inspection into the nature and condition" of the works, and wrote a strongly worded note to M. Chevalier, expressing their "deepest concern at your carrying on a ditch and rampart round the town of Chandernagore more calculated for the purpose of defence than to serve as a drain as was represented in 1768."⁸⁵

Apprehending opposition⁸⁶ from the French to a public inspection of the ditch, the Governor ordered⁸⁷ Lieut.-Col. Grant to transfer certain battalions of sepoy for duty at the Presidency, and hold the rest of the troops at Monghyr "in readiness to march at a moment's warning"⁸⁸ against Chandernagore. Mr. Graham, Resident at Burdwan, was likewise directed to keep the companies under his charge in readiness to move at the shortest notice.⁸⁹ Lieut.-Col. Campbell, however, met with no opposition during his survey of the ditch, but the result of his enquiries left no doubt as to the real purpose of the works. The authorities thereupon demanded that the ditch should be levelled up to allay all suspicions. The French not only did not care to comply with the requisition, but carried on the work "with all possible expedition."⁹⁰

A number of circumstances at this time combined to strengthen the growing belief⁹¹ that the French were preparing for a movement against the English settlements. In the first place, a letter was received⁹² from the Directors in March, wherein the latter warned that the French were sending out large reinforcements to their islands and settlements in India. In the second place, intelligence had also been received some time ago that the French were trying to obtain possession of the island of Negrais.⁹³ In the

85 Letter to the Governor and Council at Chandernagore, May 2, 1769.

86 Letter from Mr. W. Lushington, Assistant Secretary to the Council, to Mr. C. Floyer, Secretary to the Select Committee, May 12 1769, ".....military force may be required to enforce our just demands upon the Governor and Council at Chandernagore to give our Chief Engineer an opportunity of surveying the works.

87 Letter to Lieut.-Col. H. Grant, Commanding the troops at Monghyr. The Letter was written in May, but was embodied in the proceedings of the Select Committee, June 8, 1769.

88 Beng. Sel. Com., May 13, 1769.

89 *Ibid.*, May 19, 1769.

90 *Ibid.*, June 8, 1769.

91 Suspicions arose even in 1768. *Vide* Letters to Court, September 13 and 26, 1768, and Beng. Sel. Com., July 20, 1768.

92 Beng. Sel. Com., March 21, 1769.

93 Abs. I. 1766-71, Nos. 146-7.

third place, the Faujdar of Hooghly reported more than once that the French were secretly importing⁹⁴ arms, and manufacturing⁹⁵ gunpowder. In the fourth place, it was reported that thatched sheds were being erected⁹⁶ in the old fort at Chandernagore, which also indicated that the French were expecting a large force in Bengal. In the fifth place, news⁹⁷ was also received that some French ships of war with troops on board had sailed from the Cape towards India. In the last place, it was already notorious that the French were keeping more than the required number of sepoy^s at their various factories. For example, Mr. Vansittart, Chief of Midnapur, reported in March⁹⁸ that one M. Aussant had arrived at Mohanpore with a considerable force of armed sepoy^s in the capacity of Resident for the French Company.

The refusal of the French to destroy the works in dispute was naturally regarded as an added proof of their hostile intentions. The Select Committee came to the conclusion that the conduct of the French was such as clearly betrayed "a tendency to disturb the tranquility"⁹⁹ of the country. They accordingly issued peremptory orders for the forcible demolition¹⁰⁰ of the works, and Lieut.-Col. Campbell was deputed with a body of sepoy^s to execute the same. Precautionary measures were at the same time taken to guard against a sudden outbreak of hostilities with the French. Lieut.-Col. Chapman was ordered¹⁰¹ to proceed with the whole of the Second Brigade to Berhampore, and Col. Smith was directed¹⁰² to send a company of Artillery along with the Second Brigade, and remove the Third Brigade¹⁰³ from Allahabad to Bankipore, or "divide them at that place and at Monghyr."¹⁰⁴ The First Brigade, it may be pointed out, had already been ordered down to the Presidency.¹⁰⁵ The Chief and Council at Cossimbazar were warned of the danger of a rupture with the French, and were

94 Trans. R. 1768, Nos. 278, 297 etc.

95 Cop. R. 1769, No. 77.

96 Beng. Sel. Com., June 8, 1769.

97 Letter from Col. R. Smith, June 14, 1769.

98 Bengal District Records, Midnapur, II, p. 139.

99 Beng. Sel. Com., June 8, 1769.

100 Letter to Court, September 30, 1769.

101 Letter to Lieut.-Col. C. Chapman, June 8, 1769.

102 Letter to Col. R. Smith, June 8, 1769.

103 Beng. Sel. Com., June 20, 1769.

104 Letter to Col. R. Smith, June 20, 1769.

105 Letters from Lieut.-Col. H. Grant, May 23 and 25, 1769.

advised to arrange accommodation for the Second Brigade in the new cantonments at Berhampore.¹⁰⁶ On the representation¹⁰⁷ of the authorities at Cossimbazar that the cantonments at Berhampore could not accommodate the whole of the Second Brigade, orders¹⁰⁸ were issued for the supply of tents, and for the erection of temporary bungalows to provide additional accommodation for the officers.

Agreeably to the orders of the authorities, Lieut-Col. Campbell proceeded to Chandernagore early in June, and the Faujdar of Hooghly was ordered to supply "as many thousands of coolies" as the Chief Engineer might require to fill up the ditch.¹⁰⁹ The Faujdar having left¹¹⁰ for Murshidabad to attend the 'Punyaha', his deputy failed to collect a sufficient number of coolies, whereupon he was severely rebuked by Mr. Cartier, and was asked "to persuade the coolies whom the French have collected to leave their services and come over to this side."¹¹¹ Despite all his efforts,¹¹² the Naib-Faujdar could not supply more than eighty coolies. The authorities were so disgusted at his "negligence and incompetence" that they threatened¹¹³ him with "condign punishment", if the required number of coolies were not forthwith procured.

Meanwhile, orders were issued from Murshidabad for the transfer¹¹⁴ of Sayyid Muhammad Ali Khan, the former Faujdar of Hooghly, to Purneah. and a stronger¹¹⁵ man, Raziuddin Muhammad Khan, was appointed in his place expressly for expediting the levelling up of the ditch. In view of the reported scarcity¹¹⁶ of coolies in the Hooghly district, the new Faujdar brought a large number of coolies from Murshidabad itself.¹¹⁷ He too was, however, reproved for his negligence,¹¹⁸ although he appears to have collected more than 700 coolies.¹¹⁹ The work of filling up the ditch was further hampered by the frequent desertion of the coolies. For example, towards

106 Beng. Sel. Com., June 10, 1769.

107 Letter from the Chief and Council at Cossimbazar, June 19, 1769.

108 Beng. Sel. Com., July 8, 1769.

109 Cop. I. 1769, No. 18.

110 Cop. R. 1769A, No. 22.

111 Cop. I. 1769, No. 20.

112 Cop. R. 1769A, No. 25.

113 Cop. I. 1769, No. 21.

114 Cop. R. 1769A, No. 34.

115 *Muzaffar Nāmah* (Alld. Univ. MS.), p. 444.

116 Cop. R. 1769, No. 31.

117 *Muzaffar Nāmah* (Alld. Univ. MS.), p. 444.

118 Cop. I. 1769, No. 30.

119 Trans. R. 1769, No. 75.

the end of July more than 600 coolies were reported to have deserted.¹²⁰ At last, the ditch was levelled up with the help of 800 sepoy.¹²¹

Such strong measures taken against the authorities of Chandernagore eventually provoked acrimonious complaints from the French Court to the Government of England, as a result of which, after Verelst's departure from India, a representative was appointed¹²² by the Crown to report on the differences between the servants of the two Companies in Bengal.

NĀNDALAL CHATTERJI

120 Cop. R. 1769, No. 50. The desertion was alleged to be due to "the severity of the Captains." (Trans. R. 1769, No. 95).

121 Stavorinus, *Voyage to the East Indies*, I, pp. 529-30. *Muzaffar Nāmah* (Alld. Univ. MS.), p. 445. Letter to Court, September 30, 1769.

122 Letter from Court, June 27, 1720. Sir John Lindsay was the accredited agent on the part of the Crown.

A critical Study of Kalyan Singh's *Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh*

Maharaja Kalyan Singh, the son and successor of the famous Maharaja Shitab Rai who contributed so much towards the consolidation and progress of the British power in northern India, and also served as the Naib-Subadar and Naib Diwan of Bihar for a period of 7 years (1765-1772), was himself an important officer and certainly connected with some of the events that happened in Bihar and elsewhere, both during the regime of his father and his own period of deputy-governorship of Bihar from 1773 to 1781. Even after the settlement¹ of the whole Subah of Bihar for an annual sum of 34 lakhs of rupees, which reduced Maharaja Kalyan Singh to the position of the Chief renter of Bihar, he continued to be looked upon as Naib Nazim and Rai-i-Rayan of the province, and was addressed as such by the Governor as late as September 19,² 1784, if not later. He was not only a politician and an administrator but also an accomplished³ scholar and a poet of no mean order.

Besides his numerous poetical effusions and other literary⁴ productions, he left for posterity a historical work entitled *Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh*. Naturally this work is expected to be of great value for the history of the eastern provinces of India, especially from the sixties to the eighties of the

1 KT., 546; Hand, 17.

2 CPC., IV.

3 The historian, Fakir Khairuddin, author of *Ibrat Nāma*, who visited Patna at the end of 1192 (1777), gives in his book *Tuhfa-i-Taza*, a very interesting account of his interview with the affable, sweet-tongued, highly intelligent and versatile young Raja Kalyan Singh, the Nazim of Bihar, who was prepared to discuss with him on all possible branches of 'science or arts' and ultimately offered to make his visitor the principal of his Madrasa on an annual salary of Rs. 5000. The Fakir had to admit the Islamic learnings of the Raja when the latter read out certain passages from his book *Hilyatul-Fatiman* TT., 88-90.

4 Ibrati mentions that Maharaja Kalyan Singh left behind him 3 Diwans (collections of poems), the Masnavi entitled *Tarikh-i-Zeba*, 10,000 verses in praise of Muhammad, his daughter and 12 Imams of the Shiah, and a versified history of Islam *Jadid-us-Seyar* known as (MK). This last, a fine Urdu Masnavi (versified story), two Qasidas (odes) repudiating the charge of following the Islamic faith, other eulogistic poems including one congratulating Lord Cornwallis on his victory over Tipu Sultan, and some of the works mentioned by Ibrati, have been utilized by the present writer. They are in possession of Babu Rameswar Nath, B.A., B.L., a direct descendant of Rai Mahtab Rai, the only brother of Maharaja Shitab Rai.

eighteenth century. One may suppose that as the author was an eye-witness of, and as he claims, also a participant in, some of the affairs and events that he has recorded, his book may be relied upon as one of the authoritative and original sources of information for at least the post-Diwani period. But when critically examined with reference to some of the important original historical sources of the same period, *Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh* appears to contain many inaccuracies and certain exaggerations, particularly relating to those affairs in which the author had a direct share. By an irony of fate the author had, in course of time, lost his power, position, influence and property, which he probably thought could be restored, at least partly, if not all, if he revealed to the English, the de facto master of Bengal and Bihar, in as bright colours as possible, his personal and his father's services in their behalf. In certain respects, however, as for example, in the broad outline of historical events of the period, the value of author's testimony, even when not corroborated in so many words by other sources, cannot be entirely ignored. There are also certain new informations which he⁵ alone was in a position to supply and which we cannot but give due consideration to, unless of course, we get anything contrary to the same in more reliable works. A perusal of the relevant pages of *Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh* enables us also to have a refreshing insight into the true character, motives and intention of some of the historical personalities of the period.

A few years back an eminent citizen of Patna published an English translation of *Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh* in the various⁶ issues of the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*. But on comparing it with the original manuscript⁷ of the book from which the translation was made, the present writer finds that full justice has not been done to it. In fact the translations are incomplete, due to the omission of sentences and passages⁸ at different places.

5 Though young he was highly intelligent and was certainly a spectator of, if not an actor in, the political drama that was being enacted in Behar and Oudh during the sixties and the seventies of the 18th century.

6 Volumes V and VI (1919-20).

7 The manuscript used by the translator and placed in his hand by the late Syed Khurshaid Nawab of Patna City, now belongs to Nawabzada Syed Md. Mahdi, a relation of the original owner. The Nawabzada has very kindly allowed the present writer to utilize it.

8 We may mention only a typical instance. Pages 384 to 425 of the Persian manuscript, containing about 574 original lines have been compressed within 3 pages of the English translation with not more than 111 lines.

Necessarily the original text has been unduly interfered with, being either modified, ignored or compressed. It is unfortunate that the learned translator, who is now no more in his earthly existence, did not add a preamble which might have given us an idea of his plans and the reasons for the modification and omission which characterize his translation. Be it said to his credit, however, that he was fully competent by his knowledge of both Persian and English to give a literal and at the same time an intelligent and interesting rendering of the original passages, and has nowhere distorted the meaning of, or given a version different from, that supplied by the author of the book the like of which we do find some times in some generally accepted and standard translations,⁹ of other historical works.

It is not the translation, however, but some of the statements found in the original book which have been subjected, in the following lines, to a close and critical examination, with a view to ascertaining the truth. Only a certain portion dealing with Bengal and Bihar, and not the brief summary of the history of India under the Mughals since Timur,¹⁰ has been taken into consideration in this paper.

Maharaja Kalyan Singh has said much about himself and his father in his book but nowhere does he indicate his place and date of birth. We know from other sources¹¹ that he belonged to a respectable family of Saxena Kayasthas of Delhi and he was born in that capital city somewhere about the year 1164-5 i.e. 1750-51 A.D. and died at the age of 73 years at Chitpur, Calcutta, in 1237/1822. He was therefore, about 7 years old when his father left him at Delhi with Ghaziuddin,¹² Imad-ul-Mulk, and himself

9 The present writer has pointed out in a paper recently published in *IJH.*, Madras, how Raymond was very unjust to the zemindars of Bihar by mistranslating a certain passage of the *Seyar* and giving currency to the idea that Raja Ramnarain had to drop the idea of avenging the brutal murder of his master, Siraj, because Pahlawn Singh, Sunder Singh and others whom he had written to for the purpose gave no response.

10 One fails to understand why the portion concerned with pre-Akbar Mughals including his father and grand-father has been left out in the translation.

11 *Miraj-ul-Kheyal* by Wazir Ali, Ibrati. We have got the evidence of Kalyan Singh himself who says, in more than one place, in his Persian *Masnavi*, *Tarikh-i-Zeba*, dictated and completed in 1231 (1815) (as is indicated by the colophon and also by the title which constitutes a chronogram) that he was 66 years in that year, 1231—66=1165.

12 The notorious grandson of Nizam-ul-Mulk, who acted as the king-maker and dominated Delhi politics for 5 years (1754-59).

proceeded to Bihar to manage the affairs of the Diwani-Khalsa (KT., 171). If it happened "a few months after the death of Sirajud-Dowla" it could not be exactly "the 6th year of accession (Alamgir II)" but about a year before (KT., 582-583).

Our author speaks of his having left Delhi and retired from the service of Nawab Vazir (Shuja-ud-Dowla) two and half years before the arrival of his father as an exile from Patna in the camp of Shuja-ud-Dowla (KT., 347). This happened, according to Karam Ali,¹ a contemporary authority in 1177(1763). Now the arrival of Kalyan Singh in Oudh and Allahabad in 1174-75 is not improbable but his statement regarding his appointment as a Risaladar of 2000 horse and on a salary of Rs. 4000 (KT., 307) cannot but be taken as absurd when we consider not only his age but also his other statement, elsewhere, that his father, an able, talented and experienced officer, got into the service of the same master and was put in command of the same 2000 horse and foot and was attached to the camp of Maharaja Beni Bahadur (KT., 330, 347).

We are informed by Kalyan Singh that his father having lived in Bihar for sometime, wanted to return to Delhi, but being approached by the Chief of Patna Factory (Mr. Amiyatt ?) who had heard from some of the Jagirdars and Mansabdars about his influence in the imperial court, he ultimately agreed to proceed to Murshidabad where he met Colonel Clive and Nawab Mir Jafar. Pledges of mutual friendship and service were exchanged. Shitab Rai had already assured the Chief of Patna that "he would establish the affairs of the Company in the court of the King on such a stable basis that the whole of Bengal would pass into the exclusive possession of the East India Company and remain in the hands of the English for years and years together" (KT., 584). He also added on this very occasion that "I deem it advisable to secure from the Court of the King the Subadari of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa in the name of the Nawab Sahib, and the Diwani of the said provinces for the English Company" (KT., 586). In return for "the pledges of perpetual friendship for the Nawab Sahib and Company" Shitab Rai asked for, and was promised, the office of the Naib-Subah and Naib-Diwan of Bihar with a recurring annuity of one lakh of rupees and also the Jagirs and Altamgha in this province being assigned to him and to his son Kalyan Singh and his descendants in perpetu-

ity. (KT., 588-89). This is followed by the claims that "his father and he, the slave, after taking much pain and making many efforts from this place (Bihar) to Shahjahanabad (Delhi) secured the Sanad of the Subadari of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, in the name of Mir Md. Jafar Khan and the Sanad of the Diwani of the said provinces in the name of the Company, from the Court of Alamgir II, the then Emperor of India" (KT., 590).

If any faith can be put in the above statements, then we shall have to take the affairs of the Diwani to have begun long before 1178(1765). Considering the connection of Shitab Rai with the Delhi Court, it is not improbable that his mediation was sought for getting the Sanad of the Subadari for the Bengal usurper. Ghulam Husain¹⁴ speaks of Shitab Rai's difficulties on his arrival in Bihar owing to veiled hostility of Raja Ramnarayan and the consequent friendship which Shitab Rai formed with Mir Jafar and Colonel Clive on the occasion of their arrival at Patna in 1758. We also learn further that Shitab Rai accompanied Clive to Murshidabad. Clive's correspondence¹⁵ with Emperor Alamgir II, and his Prime Minister, Ghaziuddin, dated 17th April 1758, does tell us of some letters written by the Colonel to the addressees even before this date and also that "their servant Shitab Rai" was charged with the task of 'delivering' these fresh letters to the addressees. In a letter to Raja Ramnarayan, dated¹⁶ 19th May 1758, Clive emphasises "the friendship subsisting between me and Shitab Rai." The Vazir, Ghaziuddin,¹⁷ wrote to Clive in June 1758 about the grant of Sanads to Mir Md. Jafar Khan and the latter also¹⁸ refers in his letters written in the same month and year to the "Receipts of the King's presents and Farmans for these Subahships." We know¹⁹ how Ghaziuddin did much to neutralize the efforts of Prince Ali Gohar (Shah Alam II) to capture Bihar and the zeal with which Shitab Rai aided Raja Ramnarayan and the English and fought against the Prince Imperial and his supporters is also a matter of history. As regards the Diwani, Malcolm's *Clive*,²⁰

14 *SM.*, 650.

15 Imperial Records Department—Bengal and Madras Papers, vol. III, 1757-1785.

16 *Ibid.*

17 *Ibid.*

18 *Ibid.*

19 Besides the Persian histories and the English records we have got a valuable collection of Raja Ramnarain's correspondences in *Dastur-ul-Insha* which throws interesting light on the subject.

20 Writing about the improvised Darbar of Shah Alam in the premises of the Patna Factory in 1761, Malcolm observes "The aid of the English was desired to fix the Emperor upon the throne of Delhi; and in return, an offer was made of the

Vansittart's²¹ Narrative and the letters in the *Calendar of Persian Correspondence*, vol. I. (1291-92, 1340, 1338 etc.) prove that at least in 1761, Messrs. Carnac, Coote, Ellis and Lushington were in the know of the "King wanting to grant the Diwanship of the Subah to the Company." There was a good deal of bitterness between Nawab Mir Qasim and the English owing to the interception of the letters of Shitab Rai wherein he wrote about a certain "business" which "according to Major Carnac and Mr. Lushington referred to the King's granting the Diwaniship to the Company." The Governor referred to Shitab Rai who knew the whole truth." He had been waiting about something "which His Majesty (and his Chief Minister) knew of" and "a project which failed." Did the strong stand taken up by Mir Qasim and the support he received from Governor Vansittart, cause the postponement ('dropping') of the process which had actually been at work for sometime and which came to materialize only in 1765?

Whatever may have been the beginnings of the talk about the Diwani and howsoever early the association of Shitab Rai with the English, and his readiness to promote their interests and his share in securing the Sanad of Subadari for Mir Jafar, there is no proof, however, of all that Kalyan Singh says about the negotiation having been initiated by either the Patna Chief or Colonel Clive and much less of the assurances concerning the bestowal of Niabat and annuity, jagirs etc. demanded by his father and given by the Colonel and his protégé. As, according to his own statement,²² "it was after some time when the affairs of the Diwani-i-Khalsa had been already regulated and settled on a firm basis", that Shitab Rai wanted to go back to Delhi and he was approached by the English; obviously, the account in Seyar referred to above, does not apply to the occasion. Then again it would be taxing our credulity too much to take seriously the claim of Kalyan Singh, then a mere lad of 8 or 9 years, that he was associated with his father on such a highly confidential and responsible affair as the procurement of the Sanads of Subadari and Diwani. We find almost a similar difficulty in

Diwani of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, but though the project was 'entertained at Calcutta, want of funds and alarm prevented its acceptance' *MC.*, II, 274. The actual grant of the Diwani in 1765 is viewed by Malcolm to have been "the governing efforts of his hero" and to it, we are told "Clive attached the greatest value." *MC.*, II, 338.

21 Carnac's letter, dated June 21, 1761, quoted by Vansittart tells us of the "offer of the Diwani of Bengal on condition of your (Council) being answerable for the royal revenue etc."

22 *KT.*, p. 583.

accepting all that he says about the part played by him just before the battle of Buxar.

Let us first summarize very briefly the main points concerning his achievements which we find spread over a considerable portion²³ of his book and then examine them closely to ascertain the truth.

1. After a stay of about 4 years Shitab Rai was compelled due to enmity of Mir Qasim to leave Bihar for Oudh. He entered the service of Shuja-ud-Dowla and rose very high under the latter's Chief Minister, Maharaja Beni Bahadur.²⁴ He was, however, always on the look out for information about Bengal and anxious to promote the interests of the English.
2. When the vanquished Mir Qasim fled towards Oudh (in 1763), Shitab Rai sent a congratulatory letter through his clerk, Sadhu Ram, to Mir Jafar and the English who were then encamped on their side of the Karamnasa river. The English and their protégé, Mir Jafar, availed themselves of this opportunity to send petitions and letters, addressed to the King and the Nawab Vazir, together with a cheque (Hundi) of Rs. 6 lakhs. The faithful Sadhu Ram took advantage of the occasion to plead successfully for the restoration of his master's office of Diwani and jagirs in Bihar of which the latter had been deprived by Mir Qasim. The English and the Nawab gave a written undertaking and they also directed Mir Md. Kazim, the then Naib Nazam of Bihar, to restore the Diwani and the jagirs and also help Shitab Rai in getting possession of the same.
3. The letters, petition and cheque were despatched by Sadhu Ram through Harkara (messenger) to Shitab Rai who was then at Allahabad. The latter owing to his indisposition, deputed his son, Kalyan Singh, to take these to Maharaja Beni Bahadur and impress upon him the advisability of the execution of the business.

²³ *KT.*, pp. 329-367.

²⁴ In a letter to Major Adams, dated 7-12-1763, Raja Shitab Rai writes "when he returned from the Patna province on account of the enmity of Mir Qasim, he went to the Royal army where he remained eight months with the King and the Vazir. Afterwards the latter sent him along with Raja Beni, who is Naib of the province and has authority over all the affairs of the Empire." *CPC.*, I.

4. Kalyan Singh discharged these duties satisfactorily. He had to read out the contents of the letter which "Beni Bahadur could not read for himself" and brought home to him the necessity of doing the work which would enhance his prestige, bring much good, and strengthen the friendship of Mir Jafar and the English. After a long discussion over the pros and cons of the whole question, Beni Bahadur was convinced of the arguments put forward by the young visitor. As he had been "turned into a supporter and well-wisher of Nawab Mir Md. Jafar Khan and the English gentlemen" he proceeded at once to the camp of the Nawab Vazir, accompanied by Kalyan Singh, although it was getting close upon evening.
5. Leaving his companion in the courtyard, Beni Bahadur advanced towards the Nawab Vazir, sat near his Musnad, talked with him quietly for half an hour, and ultimately "got his heart into his snare." He then called Kalyan Singh to go near them.
6. After enquiring about his father's health, the Nawab Vazir took all the papers from Kalyan Singh's hands, perused them carefully and then returned the letter of Sadhu Ram and that addressed to His Majesty. He then discussed for two hours all the pros and cons of the question and Kalyan Singh "gave as satisfactory answers as his tongue was capable of." He was supported by Beni Bahadur. The Nawab ultimately approved of the proposal (of friendship and alliance with Mir Jafar and the English and the expulsion of Mir Qasim) and praised Kalyan Singh for "having spoken well and eloquently." He warned him, however, to see that the other party did not violate the pact for it would cause his displeasure both for him and for his father. Kalyan Singh was prepared to write a paper with his blood about this affair which the Nawab said, smilingly, was not necessary. Thereafter they took leave of the Nawab.
7. Beni Bahadur having gone ahead, Kalyan Singh was taken back again to the Nawab Vazir who took out with his own hand from the waistband of Kalyan Singh the paper which contained the cheque for 6 lakhs and putting it into his pocket said "I shall keep it myself, and you will have to get it cashed." As the cheque had been referred to only in the letter of Sadhu Ram

and was not mentioned in the letter addressed to the King, the Nawab Vazir first ordered Kalyan Singh to erase the same before presenting the letter to His Majesty, and then, probably, not believing in the assurances of compliance, himself penned through the lines which referred to the cheque and also poured down upon it sufficient ink so as to make it illegible. Kalyan Singh undertook the task of having a fresh copy of Sadhu Ram's letter which would be put inside the old cover—an idea which so pleased the Nawab that he made a present of choicest and freshest fruits to his young visitor. When Kalyan Singh informed Beni Bihadur of this affair, the latter smiled and said "As the Nawab Vazir has taken the cheque, convey my congratulations to your father that his work is practically done."

8. Shitab Rai was very much pleased to hear all this and as he had not yet shaken off his illness, he again deputed his son to arrange the whole affair with the King and the Vazir through Beni Bahadur. He proved himself equal to the task. We are told that for "full two hours' hot discussion continued between him and the King and the Nawab Vazir" and questions were put and satisfactorily answered. Ultimately, through the grace of God, the affair of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa was settled for an annual tribute of 24 lakhs with a yearly present of 2 lakhs and a cash advance of 10 lakhs for the Nawab Vazir. It was resolved to grant Sanads of Subadari of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa to Nawab Mir Md. Jafar Khan and of Diwan of the said provinces to the English Company. The necessary papers and Sanads were prepared by the secretaries and duly sealed and they were made over together with robes of honour for the English and the Nawab to Kalyan Singh. The latter had already arranged with the banker, Lala Kashmiri Mal, for cashing the cheque of 6 lakhs. The receipt which the Nawab Vazir gave for it was in possession of Kalyan Singh when he wrote his book.
9. On the affair being reported to Shitab Rai, he told his son "As you have so nicely done this important work, it is better that you should yourself take both the Sanads, agreements, replies to the petitions and letters and the robes of honour to Nawab Mir Md. Jafar Khan and the English officers who are encamped

on the other side of the Karannasa, for it would be your best means of seeking their audience and enhance your honour and prestige with those people." It was on the occasion of seeking permission of the Nawab Vazir to proceed on his mission that the latter conferred upon Kalyan Singh the title of Rajah, granted him robes of honour etc., a sword, a lugged Palki, an elephant etc.

10. Having left his uncle, Mahtab Rai, in his place in the service of the Nawab Vazir, Kalyan Singh left the military camp of the latter at the head of 200 horse and 300 foot and a number of clerks and retinue. He met Beni Bahadur, took leave of his father, crossed the river and arrived at Benares where he "paid a flying visit" to Raja Balwant Singh "who was his old acquaintance" and with whom he stayed in the night and from whom he took two letters addressed to Major Carnac and other Englishmen containing his expression of friendship and constancy towards the Company.
11. As he arrived near the camp of Mir Jafar, he was received by Sadhu Ram who arranged for the interview between Kalyan Singh and the Nawab and the English. "Major Carnac, Major Adams, Major Fletcher, Major Knox and two or three other gentlemen... ..embraced the royal emissary and when all except the English officials and Sadhu Ram had retired, Raja Kalyan Singh stated all that had happened in the camps of the Nawab Vazir, King, and Beni Bahadur and presented all the documents he had brought and also gave "valuable information about the ways and manners of the other party and about the strength of the army of the Vazir and the King and their intentions." This was followed, on the next day, by a public investiture of the Nawab and the English with robes of honour. "The recipients turned in the direction of the camp of the King and made their obeisance to him." The contents of the two Sanads of Subadari and Diwani were read out by Kalyan Singh and there was an exchange of presents and gifts, the English presenting to Kalyan Singh, on behalf of the Company, Khilats, swords, elephants, pistols and also a sum of Rs. 50,000 as Peshkash.

12. During his one week's stay Kalyan Singh paid respects to the Nawab and the English twice a day, did much to promote the interests of his father, secured a Khilat for Sadhu Ram whom he sent to Patna to manage the affairs of the Diwani (Khalsa) and his jagirs there, and also obtained a reply to the letter of Balwand Singh, "the foundation of whose friendship with the English he had succeeded in strengthening." On his way back he put up at night, with Balwand Singh at Ramnagar and "exhorted him to serve the cause of, and be loyal to, the English and the Company."
13. Crossing the Ganges he arrived in the camp of the Nawab Vazir at Jhust (Allahabad) where he heard that Mir Qasim having learnt of the despatch of royal patents and robes of honour and the settlement of the Bengal affairs through Shitab Rai and his son, approached the Nawab Vazir, humiliated himself before him, accused Shitab Rai of intrigues and fraudulent dealings, and even tried in vain to bribe the Nawab Vazir with 10 lakhs for ordering the execution of Shitab Rai. The Vazir promised to help the ex-Nawab of Bengal in getting back his Subadari and also to send away Shitab Rai from his presence. The latter, before his departure, "saw Maharaja Beni Bahadur, spoke out what was proper and impressed upon him everything which was necessary." At first Kalyan Singh felt very much perturbed but being encouraged by the reassuring words of Beni Bahadur said to the latter "As the whole affair of the peace with the Nawab Mir Jafar and the English was done through me and my father and you also were a party to it, now that Mir Qasim, owing to the support of Salar Jung, has disturbed the situation, and brought indignity on all three of us, you will, on no account, give up the thread of amity and friendship with the English gentlemen, for this would ultimately serve your purpose." Maharaja Beni Bahadur replied "whatever you have said will be acted upon." "In short, the Maharaja, in his heart of hearts, remained firm in his pledge and consequently put no heart in the battle of Buxar."
14. Next day, when Kalyan Singh approached the Nawab Vazir, the latter at first paid no heed to him: but when all the visitors

had retired, he lifted up the drooping head of young Kalyan Singh, asked him as to how he was, accepted the usual *Nazar*, and assured him that his father had been advisedly sent to Partabgarh but he would continue attending on him as usual, though he should not go to him when Mir Qasim was in his company for that "troublesome fellow" was an enemy to him and his father. Being encouraged by the Vazir's enquiry about Mir Jafar and the English, Kalyan Singh spoke about the wisdom and straight dealings of the latter and added that the English, despite the fewness of their troops were past masters in the art of warfare. If friendly relations were cultivated with the English, it would conduce to an increase in the wealth and prosperity of his master. The Nawab Vazir said "let us see what happens." After this Kalyan Singh gave a true account of all that had happened and again spoke against the fickle-minded, cowardly and pledge-breaking Mir Qasim, and brought out, by way of contrast, the high character of the English and Mir Jafar. The Nawab Vazir said, "I, too, realise what you have thought about, but you should hold your peace and utter not a word. Let us see what Providence wishes to happen."

There is much in this pretty long account given by one who was an eye-witness, and apparently one of the principal participants in the whole transaction, which remains uncorroborated by any other sources, contemporary or otherwise. Evidence is, however, not lacking of Shitab Rai's continued attachment to the English and "his representing to the King and the Vazir the loyalty²⁵ of the English ever since his arrival there." He forwarded letters of the English and their protégé and gave to the latter useful information about the movements²⁶ and intentions of his new masters (*CPC.*, I). We also learn from his correspondence about the sending of Sadhu Ram,²⁷ his Diwan, to Mir Jafar and the English, and referring to him for particulars. It is also a fact, as Karam Ali²⁸ and the English records²⁹ tell us, that Mir Jafar and an English detachment led by Adams etc. had marched in pursuit of Mir Qasim upto Karamnasa and the usurper of Bengal lay encamped for 4 months on the bank of Durgāvatī. Discussions

²⁵ *CPC.*, I, 2026.

²⁶ *CPC.*, I, 1927, 1935, 2040, 2065 etc.

²⁷ *CPC.*, I, 1935 dated 7-12-1767.

²⁸ *MN.*

²⁹ Broomes.

also did take place about the royal money (tribute) and attempts were made through the despatch³⁰ of Peshkash and Nazars to win over the King and the Nawab Vazir. Karam Ali³¹ tells us that in the very first interview between Mir Qasim and Beni Bahadur on the 17th of Jamadi I, 1177 (24th November, 1763) differences arose which became further aggravated, so much so, that Beni Bahadur, as Ghulam Hussain³² also states, became determined to prevent the realization of the cherished object of Ali Jah (Mir Qasim) and to induce his master to come to a settlement with Mir Jafar and the English. We also get evidence of the fact that both Beni Bahadur and Balwand Singh gave only a lukewarm³³ support to, and acted rather treacherously towards, their chief, the Nawab Vazir, on the occasion of the battle³⁴ of Buxar. We know also that Beni Bahadur and Shitab Rai did much to "procure the Sanad" of the Subadari" and we are informed by Shitab Rai himself that he had obtained the Sanad and the Khilats but was prevented from conveying them personally, firstly because he had to await the arrival of Beni Bahadur³⁵ and latterly because the "treachery of Mir Qasim"³⁶ detained him and caused his departure for Lucknow." The King in his letter signifies his readiness to "grant the Sanads of the province" on certain conditions and refers for particulars to "Raja Shitab Rai,"³⁸ a true friend of the English." The Sanads were actually despatched, as we learn from certain letters, through Sadhu Ram, and Shitab Rai also "sent a

30 MN.

31 MN.

32 SM

33 A contemporary authority, Subhan Ali, author of *Tarikh-i-Benares* says that at the battle of Puchapahari (Patna) Beni Bahadur prevented Balwand Singh from exerting himself on behalf of their master—*TB*, 95.

The historian Fakir Khairuddin writes—"It was reported to the Nawab Vazir that there was a long-standing friendship between Raja Balwand Singh and Raja Shitab Rai; that the former was in intrigues with the English through the intermediary of the latter; that their alluring words had found entrance into the heart of Beni Bahadur, too; consequently at the time of fight they were standing as mere spectators." The Nawab Vazir became definitely suspicious but he could not afford to alienate them further at that time. *TT.*, 47a.

34 Besides Subhan Ali's charges of "perfidy and disloyalty" against Balwand Singh, we get another definite evidence of the same in a letter addressed to Shitab Rai by his agent Raja Kheyali Ram, on Nov. 12, 1764 wherein we read, "Raja Balwand Singh, in conformity with his engagements, did not take part in the battle (Buxar), but remained on the other side of the river under the pretence of sickness" *CPC.*, I, 2459.

35 *CPC.*, I, 1964, 1985, 2000, 2002, 2121, etc.36 *CPC.*, I, 2096. 37 *CPC.*, I, 2125.38 *CPC.*, 1945, 2035.

scheme³⁹ for the destruction of the ex-Nawab." The change in the attitude of Shuja-ud-Dowla on the intervention of Salar Jung⁴⁰ and other supporters of Mir Qasim and the advised exile of Shitab Rai are also borne out by other sources. Again, considering the character of Shuja-ud-Dowla, we may take the Hundi affair to be within the range of probabilities, especially because of the reference to the receipt of the Nawab Vazir being present in possession of Kalyan Singh at the time he wrote his history.⁴¹

Despite all that has been said above, one cannot but take Kalyan Singh's version with a grain of salt. Though he has furnished us with such wealth of details, he has unfortunately omitted to give the dates of Sadhu Ram's visit to Mir Jafar's camp, of his own interviews with Beni Bahadur, and with the Vazir and the King, and of his mission to the military camp on the other side of Karamnasa. The English army had reached near the bank of Karamnasa on the 5th December⁴² and Major Adams had left the command of the army to Major Knox and proceeded to Calcutta where he died on the 13th January 1764. Major Knox also did not continue for long and had to resign very soon in favour of Captain Jennings. How Messrs. Adams, Knox and Carnac could embrace Raja Kalyan Singh on his arrival in the camp of Mir Jafar when we find Governor's letter dated⁴³ 10th December 1763, about "Mir Jafar proceeding to Sasaram" and not yet encamped at Karamnasa. Then there is the question of Kalyan Singh's age in 1177(1763-64) which was not more than 12 or 13 years. Undoubtedly, he was a gifted boy and appears to have been given a good education. An indulgent and loving father may have also been anxious to initiate his son into the mysteries of diplomatic dealings. But a highly responsible and confidential work such as the conduct of negotiation between the King, the Nawabs of Oudh and Bengal, and the English, could be hardly entrusted into the single hand of an immature youth. The fact that neither the contemporary works and records of either of the English or the Indians, nor even the letters of Shitab Rai himself, make the slightest reference to Kalyan Singh, is too significant to be lost sight of. Again one is apt to take from Kalyan Singh's account that he was in no inconsiderable degree responsible for the cultivation of friendly

39 CPC., I, 1221, 2124.

40 TB., 94b.

41 CPC., I, 21, 25.

42 Broome 40. Broome gives 16th January, as the date of Adam's death but Governor's letter has been relied upon CPC., 2028.

43 CPC., I.

relation between Beni Bahadur, Balwand Singh and the English officials. Apart from the objection because of the disparity of age, the correspondences⁴⁴ of Raja Ramnaram conclusively prove that these people had already become well-disposed towards the overthrowers of Siraj-ud-Dowla and the vanquisher of Shah Alam. This friendship was, perhaps, largely due to the mediation⁴⁵ of Raja Shitab Rai. There are reasons to believe that Shitab Rai definitely conceived the brilliant idea of the grant of Diwani to the Company as far back as 1760-61,⁴⁶ if not earlier but there is no definite proof of the details of the transaction as given, by Kalyan Singh, having been agreed upon in pre-Buxar days.

Certain it is that a regular communication was kept up through Shitab Rai and also others in the Court of the King and the Vazir; that it was Shitab Rai who "recommended"⁴⁷ that letters requesting Sanads for the provinces should be sent to the Court," that he sent on 7th December 1763, Sadhu Ram, his Diwan, and a man of trust and "well acquainted with all the affairs of the Imperial Court,"⁴⁸ that Beni Bahadur received Major Adams's letters through Raja Shitab Rai and forwarded them to the Court and also "wrote to the Vazir in proper"⁴⁹ manner; that Raja Shitab Rai wrote to Major Adams (recorded on 11th December 1763) about his intended march with the dresses which were prepared for the Major and Nawab Mir Jafar at the head of 100 horsemen;⁵⁰ that Raja Shitab Rai wrote to Major Knox in January,⁵¹ 1764, about his repairing to the Court and getting the Sanads ready which would be delivered to him as soon as the Peshkash money arrived; that Raja Shitab Rai informed Captain Stables in March,⁵² 1764, that he had been dismissed with the Sanads, but had deferred his departure, and that he was detained owing "to my departure for Lucknow in consequence of the treachery"⁵³ of Mir Qasim" and had to send the Sanads, Farmans and Khilat, which he had obtained, through Sadhu Ram, who handed them over to Mir Jafar at Buxar⁵⁴ on the 24th March 1764.

44 *DI.* A paper read before the last Calcutta session of Indian History Congress by the writer contains extracts from some of these letters.

45 Vide the testimony of the historian Khairuddin, referred to above.

46 Vide above.

47 *CPC.*, I, 1927, 1935.

48 *CPC.*, I, 1927, 1935.

49 *CPC.*, I, 1964.

50 *CPC.*, I, 1985

51 *CPC.*, I, 2039.

52 *CPC.*, I, 2096.

53 *CPC.*, I, 2125.

54 *CPC.*, I, 2154.

There is no mention of the Diwani in any of these letters nor that Kalyan Singh was in any way connected with the affair. It may be that young Kalyan Singh was associated with more elderly experienced persons, such as his own uncle, Mahtab Rai, or his father's trusted Diwan, Sadhu Ram, in most of these transactions, but as he dictated his book after a lapse of "48 or 49 years in 1219(1812)"⁵⁵ when he had become old and blind, and as he was anxious to bring home to Mr. Abraham Weland(?), the Chief of the appellate Court of Patna, at whose instance he had undertaken the composition of the history, the services he had himself rendered to the English so that he might get back, through his mediation, the jagir and allowances that he had lost, he consciously or unconsciously gave an exaggerated and confused account of the part played by him on the eve of the battle of Buxar.

The enumeration of his services does not end here. We are taken to the battle of Pachapahari (Patna) which resulted in a defeat of Shuja-ud-Dowla in May 1764, and told that Kalyan Singh was present in the army of the Oudh Nawab while he lay encamped at Phulwari for about 15 days before delivering his attack on Patna. During this period Sadhu Ram, who was then in the City, managed to secure the permission of Mir Jafar and the English and saw Kalyan Singh twice or thrice. The latter gave him valuable information about "the King's"⁵⁶ being well-disposed towards the English and about the inward and constant friendship of Beni Bahadur and Balwand Singh and their being kept firm in their pledges of the past." He asked Sadhu Ram to "convey his compliments to the English and to Mir Jafar and assure them that he was ever on the look out for an opportunity to help them, and would do his best to carry out their behests to the best of his capacity and in the same way as that of his father."

We next get an account of the battle of Pachapahari in which the Nawab Vazir and his Rohilla and Sannyasi troops performed feats of valour, capturing drums and other things of the English and for a time causing violent commotion in the opposite ranks. The description is refreshing and accurate and is borne out by other sources.⁵⁷ Kalyan Singh states what appears to have been a fact that Maharaja Beni Bahadur and Balwand Singh who stood on the right side of the Nawab did not⁵⁸ exert themselves as

55 *KT.*, p. 14; last page.

57 *SM.*, *TM.*, *IN.*, etc.

56 *KT.*, 374.

58 *Vide above.*

they should have done. But we have no other corroborative evidence about the statement that when the Nawab Vazir and his allies fell back upon Phulwari towards the evening, Kalyan Singh who had been standing at a certain place with some others, sent some messenger to Major Carnac and the English officials and being summoned by them secretly went to their camp and saw them. "Having told them"⁵⁹ what had to be said and enquired after everything that was worth knowing" he stole back to his camp.

As regards the account of the subsequent skirmishes—after the recovery of the Vazir from trouble in the legs (probably a wound),—which continued for a month till the rainy season set in, in the course of which the Vazir again gave proof of his personal valour, extricating himself from the danger of being captured, and then marched back to Buxar, there is nothing to take exception to. The treachery of Samru, the plunder and humiliation of the unfortunate Mir Qasim and the reasons thereof are also substantially correct. Raja Shitab Rai's recall to the Vazir's camp for effecting an accommodation with the English in June, his arrival at Patna and conference and conversation with Mir Jafar on the 2nd of July, his accompanying the latter to Calcutta in the middle of August, the terms proposed centering round the relinquishment of Bihar and the remission of royal revenue etc. and the detention of Shitab Rai in Bengal are mentioned in the letter of the Calendar and bear out the version in *Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh*. The details given there are interesting, especially the impossible demands⁶⁰ suggested at first by the Nawab Vazir and Raja Shitab Rai's humble but more practical submissions thereon.

We next get a fairly correct account of Major Munro's appointment to the command of the forces at Azimabad, his suppression of a mutiny⁶¹ in the English army near the bank of the river Ghoghra, his march to Buxar and the battle he "fought and won over Shuja-ud-Dowla." It is the true version of an eye-witness and an accurate observer and, therefore, a first hand information that we get here about the battle of Buxar.

⁵⁹ *KT.*, 378.

⁶⁰ *KT.*, 388. The original demand meant the payment of an annual tribute of 30 lakhs together with about 50 lakhs for war expense and the relinquishment of the Subah of Bihar in favour of the Nawab Vazir.

⁶¹ This does not find even a reference in the translation but is borne out by other sources.

The Nawab Vazir, we⁶² are told, fled across the river Ganges towards Allahabad, leaving Beni Bahadur and Kalyan Singh to induce the Emperor to follow and join his Vazir. But His Majesty paid no heed, did not move from his place, and refused to cross the Ganges for "he had already conveyed the message of friendship for, and strengthened the basis of his alliance with, the English through Maharaja Shitab Rai." This is proved also by the letters in the Calendar.⁶³ As desired by the King, Kalyan Singh remained in the royal camp. Having enclosed the King's Shuqqa in his⁶⁴ own letter, Kalyan Singh sent it to Major Munro, who on receipt thereof, marched forward, though not authorized by the Council at Calcutta, towards the King's camp while Beni Bahadur marched away across the river Ganges. Nawab Munirud-Dowla⁶⁵ and Kalyan Singh were sent ahead to receive Major Munro. The Major and the King's army crossed the river, entered Benares and encamped at some distance from each other near Pisach Mochan(?). Next day Kalyan Singh had a private interview⁶⁶ with the Major who first enquired about his father and was told that he was at Calcutta and then disclosed to the Major how he, in accordance with the direction of his father, had persuaded the King to keep to his pledges to the English and abstain from accompanying the army of the vanquished Vazir. The Major is said to have become so much impressed that he asked the young man to remain in his camp but Kalyan Singh told him that his presence in the royal camp was necessary in the interest of the Company itself.

The separation of the⁶⁷ King and the Vazir, the former's undignified conduct in courting the favour of the foreigners through Shitab Rai, and Major Munro's and (Captain Stable's) being "admitted to the presence⁶⁸ and made happy by royal favours" are proved facts. But it was Munirud-

⁶² *KT.*, 397.

⁶³ *CPC.*, 2063

⁶⁴ *KT.*, 402.

⁶⁵ The founder of the Bhiknapahari. House of Nawabs of Patna and Bhagalpore.

⁶⁶ *KT.*, 402

⁶⁷ *CPC.*, I, 2485. The contents of the King's letter (2467, 2469) and his general conduct may be contrasted by the attitude and sentiments of Mir Jafar as depicted by Karam Ali. We are told that Mir Jafar refused to accept Nazars for the victory at Buxar. "On the contrary he uttered 'where is the victory and what defeat? The little prestige that was left has now vanished in the air' (*MN.*, 910/a).

⁶⁸ *CPC.*, I, 2385.

Dowla, the King's Mir Saman (Comptroller of the Household) who was in correspondence with Major Munro and it was he who sent to the latter the King's Shuqqa⁶⁹ through Suchit Ram, Raja Shitab Rai's Vakil at Benares. On the other hand, Kalyan Singh finds no place anywhere in the contemporary records. Though not improbable, his personal references here are, as usual, not very convincing.

Before concluding this paper, because it has become too long, one very important fact regarding the extent of indebtedness which Kalyan Singh owed to the well-known Patna historian, Nawab Ghulam Hussain Khan, has to be emphasized. Though not copied verbatim, a considerable portion of *Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh* represents the unacknowledged version available in the pages of *Seyar-ul-Mutakherin*. Even as regards the account of Nawab Mir Md. Qasim Khan whose history it was his primary object to write, we find the ground covered to be much common in both except that about his last days, death in penury and the fate of his seven sons which he, for the first time, has furnished us with.

S. H. ASKARI

Nāndī in Theory

Students of Sanskrit literature are well acquainted with the fact that Sanskrit dramas commence with a stanza (or stanzas) called *nāndī*, which is followed by the prelude. The nature and function of *nāndī* have not yet been exhaustively dealt with.

The earliest known work on dramaturgy, the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharatācārya, in its present form was known by the beginning of the Christian era. In this paper the definitions etc. as given in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and other dramaturgical works whose chronological order¹ is well nigh accepted by scholars have been dealt with here.

After quoting all the characteristics found in *NS*. first, I have omitted those repeated in the later works.

In *NS*² characteristics of *nāndī* are given in chapters I, V, p. 219 and p. 239. In ch. I. (p. 25) it is stated that *nāndī* should have words expressing blessings (आशीर्वाचन). It should have eight padas (अष्टाङ्गपदः).³ It should be striking (विचित्र) i.e. poetically beautified, and lastly it should be वेदिनिर्मित⁴.

Then in ch. V (p. 219) we find that *nāndī* should be in honour of gods, brāhmaṇas, king, or it should please these persons, and should always be resorted to.

In ch. V (p. 239) it is added that *nāndī* may have eight or twelve padas.⁵ There must be two पारिपाश्वर्य by the side of the सूतधार who recites *nāndī*,

1 The order of the sources and the authors quoted is as follows:

(१) नाट्यशास्त्र (२) आदिभरत (as quoted by Kāle in his commentary on प्रियदर्शिका) (३) बादरायण (as quoted by नाटकलक्षणरत्नकोष) (४) भास (as quoted by Rāghavabhaṭṭa), (५) मानुस्मृत (as quoted by Raṅganātha) (६) अमिपुराण (७) अभिनवभारती (८) दशरूपक (९) नाटकलक्षणरत्नकोष (१०) नाट्यदर्पण (११) भावप्रकाश (१२) प्रतापमुदीय (१३) रसार्णवसुधाकर (१४) साहित्यदर्पण (१५) नाट्यप्रदीप (as quoted by Rāghavabhaṭṭa) (१६) नाट्यलोचन (as quoted by Raṅganātha), (१७) संगीतकल्पतरु (as quoted by Rāghavabhaṭṭa).

2 Gackwad Oriental Series, no. XXXVI, vol. 1.

3 The term पद I shall explain later on, hence not translated here.

4 This word is explained in अभिनवभारती, the quotation from which I shall give later on.

5 Here पद means an अवान्तरवाक्य ।

and they should speak the words एवमस्तु at the end of every पद of nāndī. There is also a note that by the proper execution of nāndī, Candra is pleased.⁶

According to the *Ādibharata*⁷ (as quoted by Kale in his commentary on प्रियदर्शिका p. 2), in addition to Bharata's आशीर्वचन nāndī should have salutation (नमस्क्रिया); it should suggest the plot of the play (काव्यार्थसूचकः) and it should have eight or ten padas.

According to Bādarāyaṇa (as quoted in नाटकलक्षणरत्नकोष p. 46) it is understood that nāndī is obligatory, which is the same as नित्य of NŚ.

Bhāsa (as quoted by Rāghavabhaṭṭa in his commentary on *Sākuntala*, Nir. Pr. p. 2) seems to have given the definition of nāndī in accordance with that of the *Ādibharata*. The definition⁸ is not quoted fully by Rāghavabhaṭṭa, but the last word वस्तु suggests that he favoured the suggestion of plot in nāndī.

Mātr̥gupta (as quoted by Raṅganātha in his commentary on विक्रमोर्वशीयम् p. 7) gives the definition of nāndī, which is the same as that of *Ādibharata*.

In *Agnipurāṇa* (ch. 338, v. 8-9) we find that nāndī is one of the 22 divisions of the पूर्ववक्त्र. It adds to the word आशीर्वचन of Bharata, prayers to the elders and benedictions of गोब्राह्मणनृपादि.

Abhinavaguptācārya in his commentary on NŚ. of Bharata, has discussed the various characteristics of nāndī (on pages 25, 219, 239, chs. I, V). He has clarified the meanings of certain terms used by Bharata.

6 Bharata has given illustration of nāndī in ch. V, v. 110-113:—

नमोस्तु सर्वदेवेभ्यः द्विजातिभ्यः शुभं तथा ।
जितं सोमेन वै राज्ञा शिवं गोब्राह्मणाय च ॥
ब्रह्मोत्तरं तथैवास्तु हता ब्रह्मद्विषस्तथा ।
प्रशास्त्रिमां महाराजः पृथिवीं च ससागराम् ॥
राष्ट्रं प्रवर्धतां चैव रत्नस्याशा समृद्ध्यतु ।
प्रेक्षाकर्तुर्महान्धर्मो भवतु ब्रह्मभावितः ॥
काव्यकर्तुर्यशश्चास्तु धर्मश्चापि प्रवर्धताम् ।
इज्यया चानया नित्यं प्रीयन्तां देवता इति ॥
एवं नान्दी विधातव्या यथावल्लक्षणान्विता ।
नान्दीप्रयोगे च कृते प्रीतो भवति चन्द्रमाः । (v. 50).

7 आशीर्नमस्क्रियारूपः श्लोकः काव्यार्थसूचकः नान्दीति कथ्यते—

8 आशीर्नमस्क्रियावस्तु—

He explains the word नित्य as suggesting the daily recital of nāndī—that is nāndī should be recited everyday of the performance, unlike some other items of पूर्वरङ्ग, which may not be resorted to daily. Bharata has said that nāndī should be in honour of god, brāhmaṇa and king. To this Abhinava has added that it should also be in honour of a प्रेक्षापति i.e., the guest of honour. He adds a note that this nāndī is called प्ररोचना when it occurs as an element of भारतीवृत्ति. Abhinava explains वेदनिर्मित of Bharata as authorised by वेद. Even according to Śrutis, आर्शाः or blessing must be in the beginning of every work.

In *Daśarūpaka*⁹ (book 3, p. 80 Columbia University Press) we read that nāndī should please the audience and the verses must be sweet.

In *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa* (p. 46) it is stated that nāndī is सूत्रधार-प्रयोज्या i.e., to be introduced by the stage-manager.

In *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* (चतुर्थविवेक० v. 154) the illustration of nāndī as given by Bharata together with the definition similar to Bharata is given. Moreover the authors add that nāndī should have six or eight padas and also add to Bharata's item, (viz. nāndī should be in honour of gods, brāhmaṇa and king) the terms सरस्वती and कवि. To Bharata's आशोर्वचन ND adds गुणोत्कीर्तन i.e. praises of merits. Nāndī is supposed to remove अट्ट १८८ i.e. obstacles in the way of performance. ND also gives that nāndī may be composed by the poet or the manager of the company of actors (कविकृता and सूत्रधारकृता). Moreover it is the 12th item of पूर्वरङ्ग: also according to ND नान्दीपाठकः or the reciters of nāndī are the सूत्रधार, स्थापक and पारिपार्श्वकः.

Raṅganātha in his commentary on विक्रमोर्वशीयम् (p. 7 अङ्क I) quotes the following under the name of ND.—यस्यां बीजस्य विन्यासो ह्यभिधेयस्य वस्तुनः । श्लेषेण वा समासोक्त्या नाम्ना पलावली तु सा as a definition of nāndī. But this quotation cannot be traced in the present edition of ND. It seems Raṅganātha has committed some mistake here, and the opinion quoted is of some other person.

In *Bhāva-prakāśa* (p. 196-197) nāndī is derived from (नन्दी—the bull of the God Śiva. According to BP the bull (नन्दी of Śiva), was dancing and it became worthy of representation in that form. Its worship in that form is called नान्दी. Another explanation is that expression which rejoices (the audience) by means of auspicious salutations to god is nāndī. Further, it is explained that what rejoices the audience being one of the 22

items of पूर्वराज is also called nāndī (the word नान्दी is here derived from √नन्द् to please or to rejoice).

It adds that there must be the word चन्द्र or its synonym in the nāndī verse or the poet, at any rate, should indicate or suggest चन्द्र in the nāndī verse. The सूत्रधार should recite it in मध्यम स्वर (resorting to the middle tone) and there should be 8 or 12 पदs or sentences.

Pratāparudrīya (pp. 123-124) in the definition of nāndī adds the words direct or indirect suggestion of the plot to the words of *Ādibharata* and others (काव्यार्थसूचकः). Nāndī according to *PR* may have 8, 12, 18 or 22 पदs. Also it should be चन्द्रनामाङ्किता and मङ्गलार्थपदोज्ज्वला. In *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* (pp. 165-266) the same description as in *PR* is given, only there is a difference in the number of पदs. According to *RS* पदs may be 8, 10 or 12 in number.

Sābityadarpaṇa (ch. VI, p. 63, v.23-25) in the definition of nāndī quotes *NS*. and adds that nāndī should have words signifying auspicious objects like शङ्ख, चन्द्र, अञ्ज, कोक and कैरव. It should have 8 or 12 पदs.

In the commentary on *Śākuntala* Rāghavabhaṭṭa has quoted definitions of nāndī as given in most of the works on dramaturgy and has added one more definition (Act I, p. 5), of nāndī given in *Nāṭyapradīpa*. According to this quotation nāndī is composed of the poems which please the audience, the poets and the actors (कुशीलवs). Here too nāndī is derived from √नन्द् to please.

In the commentary on *विक्रमोर्वशीयम्* Raṅganātha has quoted (on p. 6 Act I.) from *Nāṭyalocaṇa*, according to which there should be flower-offering to the bees; i.e. flower-offering to the connoisseurs (सहृदयs) in addition to the other requirements of आशीर्नमस्क्रिया etc.¹⁰ given by the sources quoted before. It should have 8 or 12 पदs.

In his commentary on *Śākuntala* Rāghavabhaṭṭa has quoted (p. 6, Act I) from संगीतकल्पतरु in which it is given that nāndī may have 3, 6 or 4 पदs, and it should have the description of the moon.¹¹

Jagaddhara the commentator of *Mālatīmādhava* has given the following quotation (p. 2, Act I) from Bharata.

¹⁰ आशीर्यज्ञ नमस्क्रिया च शशिनः संकीर्तनं वस्तुनो निर्बशी गुरुसंस्तुतिर्मधुसिद्धा मोदाय पुष्पाञ्जलिः ॥

¹¹ हरोत्तमाङ्गस्थितिवस्तुषण्यैर्वाक्यार्थः etc.

यद्वाह भरतः—‘यद्यप्यङ्गानि भूयांसि पूर्वैरङ्गस्य नाटके । तथाप्यवश्यं कर्तव्या नान्दी विघ्न-
प्रशान्तये ।’ नान्दीलक्षणं च भरते—देवद्विजनुपादीनामाशीर्वचनपूर्विका । नान्दी कार्या
बुधैर्यज्ञात्मकारेण संयुता ॥ गङ्गा नागपतिः सोमः स्वधानन्दो जयाशिषः । एभिर्नामपदैः
कार्या नान्दी कविभिरङ्किता ॥ प्रशस्तपदविन्यासा चन्द्रसंकीर्तनान्विता । आशीर्वादपरा
नान्दी योज्येयं मङ्गलान्विता ॥ काचिद्वादशपदा नान्दी कान्विदष्टपदा स्मृता । सूत्रधारः
पठेदेनां मध्यमं स्वरमास्थितः ॥ चन्द्रसंकीर्तनं यत् तद्धीनो रसोत्तमः । प्रीते चन्द्रमसि
स्फीता रसश्रीरिति भात्विकिः ॥’

But in the present edition of *NS* we do not find this. The quotation itself shows that the view expressed therein is that of भात्विकि, about whom nothing more is known. Anyhow according to भात्विकि who is quoted above, there should be चन्द्रसंकीर्तन and nāndī must have eight or twelve padas.

From the above quotations, we find that nāndī should have at most the following characteristics: (1) आशीर्वचन (2) नमस्किया (3) काव्यार्थसूचन (4) should be poetically beautiful (5) वेदनिर्मित (6) should be in honour of gods, brāhmaṇas, king, सभापति, सरस्वती and कवि. (7) should please सभापति, audience, actors etc. (8) should be resorted to on every day of the performance. (9) should have 3, 4, 6, 8, 12, 16, 22 पदs (10) सूत्रधार or the stage-manager should recite nāndī in middle tone and two पारिपार्श्वकs should stand on both his sides and should utter the words एवमस्तु—“thus be it so” at the end of every पद that the सूत्रधार speaks. (11) moon is pleased by proper recital of nāndī (12) it should have certain words चन्द्र, शङ्ख, अञ्ज, कोक, कैरव or their synonyms (13) should contain गुणोत्कीर्तन (14) it is derived from नन्दी or from नन्द (15) it should be accompanied by flower-offering (16) according to *ND* nāndī may be composed by the poet or by the stage-manager.,

From all these characteristics it can be gathered that nāndī in its earlier form was somewhat different from the one found to-day. It had to pass through two or three stages of evolution before it took the present form.

So far as its subject-matter goes, we clearly find three stages:

(1) The definition of nāndī as given by Bharata has आशीर्वचन and honorific words for नृप, ब्राह्मण and देव ; but काव्यार्थसूचन is not prescribed there.

(2) काव्यार्थसूचन as a part of the subject-matter of nāndī is first found in the definition given by *Ādibharata*¹² and Bhāsa.

12 For a discussion about the nature of this work see: ‘Ādibharata’ by D. R. Mankad, *ABORI.*, vol. XIII, pt. II, p. 173ff.

(3) Later on *ND* adds सद्गुणोत्कीर्तन which seems to mean expression of merits of good men (i.e. the audience).

Similarly there has been a gradual change in practice about the following three items of nāndī:

- (1) Mention of Candra.
- (2) Number of पदs.
- (3) Position of the verse.

We shall consider one by one, how this gradual change has come.

(1) Regarding the mention of Candra etc. we find in *NS* that by the performance of nāndī, moon is pleased, but that the word Candra or its synonyms should be mentioned in the nāndī verse is not prescribed in *NS*.

As late as the 12th century A.D. in *BP*, we get a clear instruction, that the word Candra or its synonyms must be expressed or suggested in the nāndī.

To this, *SD* adds that not only Candra, but मङ्गलसूचक words like शङ्ख, अञ्ज, कोक, कैरव etc. also may be mentioned.

Let us now see why Candra or such other words should be mentioned in nāndī. While expressing प्रीतो भवति चन्द्रमाः of *NS*., *NLRK* and भात्विकि say that the fruit of nāndī performance is रससंपत्ति, i.e. richness of रस in the play. Now रस is connected with the moon because, the moon is called ओषधिपति i.e. the lord of herbs. Just as the moon enriches the herbs with ओषधिरस, its mention in the nāndī may be taken to enrich the play with नाट्यरस.

This explanation of *NLRK* is more or less copied by later writers. Though this explanation by itself is plausible we may yet say that, in addition to the richness of नाट्यरस, there may be another motive for mentioning such words as Candra, कोक etc. We know that *NS* prescribes देवपूजन, in the पूर्वैरङ्ग and along with देवपूजन auspicious expressions also would be necessary. For this purpose names of certain gods, and objects connected with them may be taken as auspicious. We find that शङ्ख कमल etc. are usually connected with विष्णु and are also taken as मङ्गलसूचक. It is for this reason also that such words are prescribed to be mentioned in nāndī.

(2) Now we shall consider the question of the number of पदs:

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| (1) <i>NS</i> . | gives 8 or 12 पदs |
| (2) <i>ND</i> | „ 6 or 8 |
| (3) प्रतापरुद्रीय | „ 8, 12, 18 or 22 |
| (4) रसार्थवसुधाकर | „ 8, 10, or 12 |
| (5) संगीतकल्पतरु | „ 3, 6 or 4 |

We see that even from the beginning there has been a confusion about the interpretation of the word पद occurring in *NŚ*.

Abhinava explains पद thus in the 1st Adhyāya (p. 25):

.....अष्टौ यान्यङ्गभूतानि पदानि वाक्यं प्रति महावाक्यं वा तानि सुप्तिङन्तान्यवान्तरवाक्यानि वेत्युभयथा...विवेचकास्त्वादुः अङ्गग्रहणादत्रावान्तरवाक्यान्येतावतोपास्तानि, तत्र चाष्टद्वाद-शसङ्ख्या चतुरस्रत्र्यस्रकालानुसारिपूर्वरङ्गद्वयाभिप्रायेण । तत्र नान्दी पदैर्द्वादशभिरष्टभिर्वाप्य-लङ्कृताम् (अ 5) इत्यत्रापिशब्दाच्चतुष्पदत्वं षोडशपदत्वं चतुरस्रगतं लभ्यते । त्र्यस्रगतं च त्रिपदत्वं षट्पदत्वं चेत्येवमल्पमपि तद्भेदेन तिस्रस्तिष्ठो नान्यः ।

Again in ch. V, p. 239, Abh. says:—

वाग्रहणादपि शब्दाच्चतुष्पोडशपदत्वं चतुरस्रे पूर्वरेङ्गे, त्र्यस्रे तु षट्पदत्वमपि लभ्यते ।

It will be seen that according to Abh. पद may mean either word or अवान्तरवाक्य i.e. subordinate sentence.

Now on examining the illustration of nāndī given by *NŚ*, we find that there are exactly 12 अवान्तरवाक्यs, but words are many more than 8 or 12. Therefore it seems that according to *NŚ*, पद should be taken in the sense of sub-sentence.

Incidentally the above quotation from Abhinava gives us some additional interesting information. It seems that there were two different types of पूर्वरेङ्ग, one to be performed in the triangular (त्र्यस्र) type of theatre and the other in the rectangular (चतुरस्र) type of theatre.¹³

According to *NŚ* both the चतुरस्र and त्र्यस्र theatres may be of three types according to their measurements. Thus the three types of चतुरस्रमध्य will have (a) 108 × 108, (b) 64 × 64, (c) 32 × 32. Similarly the त्र्यस्र type too will have three subdivisions. It will be seen that out of these three sub-types, the 1st though not actually double, is yet taken as double of the 2nd and 3rd is double of the 2nd. Accordingly Abhinava here prescribes 4, 8, 16 पदs (अवान्तरवाक्ये) for चतुरस्र type and 3, 6, 12 पदs for the त्र्यस्र type. Thus according to Abhinava nāndī may have 3, 4, 6, 8, 12 or 16 padas.

NLRK explains पद thus:—

पदमपि द्वयमत्र संमतम् । श्लोकस्य पाद एव पदं तेषां मतेन श्लोकद्वयं श्लोकत्रयं वा विधातव्यम् । ये तु सुप्तिन्तं संज्ञाशब्दं पदमिच्छन्ति तेषां सुबन्ततिङन्तपदैर्द्वादशभिरष्टा-भिश्च एक एव श्लोकः कर्तव्यः । उभयमपि प्रसिद्धमेव ।

13 For the nature and construction of Sanskrit theatre see: D. R. Mankad, 'Hindu Theatre' in *IHQ.*, vol. VIII, pp. 480 ff.

Thus according to *NLRK* पद means (1) words (2) a पाद of a verse. Taking पद in the latter sense 8 or 12 पदs will mean 2 or 3 verses.

ND has the following:—

पदानि वाक्याङ्गानि । केचित् तु पूर्णवाक्यापेक्षयाऽवान्तरवाक्यानि पदानीत्याहुः ।...
षड्भिरिति त्र्यक्षमष्टभिरिति चतुरक्षं रङ्गापेक्ष्यमध्यमनान्द्या निर्देशः । त्र्यक्षरङ्गे चोत्तमा
द्वादशभिरधमा त्रिभिः पदैर्नान्दी । चतुरक्षरङ्गे पुनरुत्तमा षोडशभिरधमा चतुर्भिरिति ।

It will be seen that *ND*, following *Abhinava*, divides nāndī into अधमा मध्यमा and उत्तमा । According to this in चतुरक्ष type of theatre, nāndī with 4 पदs is अधमा, with 8 पदs is मध्यमा and with 16 पदs उत्तमा. Similarly in त्र्यक्ष type of theatre 3 पदs will represent अधमा नान्दी, 6 पदs मध्यमा and 12 पदs उत्तमा.

BP notes a view that nāndī should have even number of पदs .

From the example given by *PR* it is understood that it takes पद to mean words (including compounds). It will also be seen that the condition of 18 and 22 पदs as given by *PR* was not known earlier.

RS also takes पद in the sense of a word.

Thus we find that, पद has been taken to have the following meanings:—

(1) Word, i.e. grammatically inflected word including a समास however long, (according to अभिनव, नाटकलक्षणरत्नकोष, नाट्यदर्पण, प्रतापहृदीय, रसार्णवसुधाकर).

(2) अवान्तरवाक्य i.e. a subordinate sentence (according to *Abhinava*, *ND* and *BP*).

(3) चरण of a verse (acc. to *NLRK* and *BP*).

Now we shall consider the position of nāndī verse. In the plays that we get today, there is always a stage-direction नान्द्यन्ते ततः प्रविशति सूत्रधारः । But in some plays this direction is found before the benedictory verse and in others after the benedictory verse. This obviously means that in the first case the benedictory verse is not taken as nāndī and in the other case, it is taken as nāndī. Another natural inference should be that in the पूर्वरङ्ग there must have been two verses having the nature of benediction, out of which one was called nāndī and the other was not.

On referring to *NS* we find that there are 19 items of पूर्वरङ्ग¹⁴ given,

14 *NS*. अः V, verses 16-30.

(i) प्रत्याहार (ii) अवतरणम् (iii) आरम्भ (iv) आश्रावणा (v) बह्वृपाणिः
(iv) परिषटना (vii) संबोधना (viii) मार्गोत्सारित (ix) आसारितकिंवा

of which nāndī is the 13th. The 14th item of पूर्वरक्त according to NS, is ध्रुवा ।

According to NS. again, items one to nine (i.e. from प्रत्याहार to आसारितक्रिया) were to be performed behind the curtain i.e., before the drop-curtain was raised up. Remaining ones were to be performed after the curtain was raised up.

In connection with this, the remark नान्यन्ते when preceding the benedictory verse suggests that the nāndī preceded it and therefore nāndī was recited before the curtain was raised up; it will also suggest that the verse following the remark नान्यन्ते was not the nāndī verse and was recited after the curtain was raised up.

Now, let us see if there were two benedictory verses in the पूर्वरक्त. As remarked above, according to NS nāndī is the 13th and ध्रुवा the 14th, ध्रुवा is also a verse, but it may not always be benedictory in nature. Therefore ध्रुवा will not be the other verse which we expect.

But according to BP¹⁵ there are 22 items of पूर्वरक्त, of which nāndī is the 12th and the 13th is प्ररोचना. According to NS. प्ररोचना is 19th. Thus acc. to NS. nāndī and प्ररोचना are separated by 5 or 6 items, but acc. to BP. nāndī is immediately followed by प्ररोचना.

It is my suggestion that when we have a verse following the remark नान्यन्ते etc., it is not nāndī but प्ररोचना verse. The definition of प्ररोचना as given by NS. is (*vide* ch. V.).

उपक्षेपेण काव्यस्य हेतुयुक्तिसमाश्रया ॥२८॥

सिद्धेनामन्त्रणा या तु विज्ञेया सा प्ररोचना ।

But this will not apply to the benedictory verses which follow the remark नान्यन्ते. But BP. defines प्ररोचना thus:

प्ररोचना सा यत्नैव प्रख्यातोदात्तवस्तुनः ।

प्रशंसया प्रेक्षकाणामुन्मुखीकरणं तु यत् (p. 197, l. 16-17).

(x) गीतविधि (xi) उत्थापन (xii) परिवर्तन. (xiii) नान्दी (xiv) ध्रुवा
(xv) रक्तद्वार (xvi) चारो (xvii) महाचारो (xviii) लिगत (xix) प्ररोचना .

15 BP. अधिकार 7. verses p. 195-199:

(i) प्रत्याहार (ii) अवतरण (iii) आरम्भ (iv) आस्तावश (v) वक्त्रपाणि
(vi) परिधटना (vii) सङ्घटना (viii) मार्गसारित (ix) अपकृष्ट (x) उत्थापन
(xi) परिवर्तन (xii) नान्दी (xiii) प्ररोचना (xiv) लिगत (xv) आसारित
(xvi) गीति (xvii) ध्रुवा (xviii) लिसाम (xix) रक्तद्वार (xx) वर्षमानक
(xxi) चारो (xxii) महाचारी.

This means that प्ररोचना was a verse to please the audience. It may very well serve the purpose of nāndī.

We should note that प्ररोचना was of two kinds. प्ररोचना of *NS.* differs from the प्ररोचना of *BP.* That there were two views about प्ररोचना is noted by *NLRK.* It is said (p. 45),

तत्र । जयाभ्युदयमापन्ना मङ्गल्या विजयावहा । सर्वपापप्रशमनी पूर्वैरङ्गे प्ररोचना ॥
प्ररोचनायाः कोऽर्थः ।

प्रसिद्धार्थप्रदर्शनी प्ररोचनाभिधीयते । तद्यथा ।

अम्भोधिवारितरणे भयकातराक्ष्या लक्ष्म्या करे करतलेन हृदं धृतस्य ।
सोत्कम्पधर्मपुलकोद्गमगद्गदोक्तिः सत्त्वाश्रयो जयति कोऽपि हरेर्विकारः ॥

अन्ये त्वाहुः ।

प्रस्तुतस्यैव काव्यस्य यन्निष्पन्नेन वस्तुना कथनं सा प्ररोचना ।

यथा नरकवधे

सृष्टं तत्कीडरूपं दनुजपतिवपुर्मेदरक्ताक्तदंष्ट्रं
दृष्ट्वा लासेन दूरं भुवमभयवचोव्याहृतेऽपि प्रयान्तीम् ।
मायाकृष्णः पयोधेः क्षणविधृतचतुर्बाहुचिह्नात्ममूर्तिः
संस्थामुत्थापयन्वा द्विगुणभुजलतारोहरोमाश्रिताङ्गीम् ॥

It will be seen that the first verse quoted above is of the type of nāndī, while the second is not. In fact Abhinava explicitly calls प्ररोचना a type of nāndī, when he remarks (p. 219) एषैव च नान्दी भारत्यङ्गनिरूपणे च प्ररोचनेति निर्देक्ष्यते। Thus both प्ररोचना and nāndī were taken as benedictory verses at one time or the other.

Therefore when the remark नान्द्यन्ते etc. precedes the benedictory verses the verse is प्ररोचना, and when the remark follows it, the verse is nāndī. Consequently we will have to say that nāndī verse was recited before the curtain was raised up in the case of those plays in which the remark नान्द्यन्ते etc. precedes the verse; and in the case of those plays where the remark follows the verse, nāndī was recited after the curtain was raised up. Thus there were two practices:—

(1) Nāndī was recited after the curtain was raised up, in which case there was no other benedictory verse recited. (2) Nāndī was recited before the curtain was raised up, in which case another verse called प्ररोचना was recited after the curtain was raised up.

Of these two practices, first is attested to by *NS.*, as therein

(a) Nāndī is an item to be performed after the curtain was raised up.

- (b) There is no other benedictory verse prescribed, which can serve the purpose of *nāndī*; both ध्रुवा and प्ररोचना according to the definitions of *NS.* do not show any benedictory nature.

Therefore the first practice is likely to be earlier in point of time. But we should remember that ours is a highly conventionalised stage and when both these practices must have come into existence, in certain parts of the country one was adopted as a convention while elsewhere the other was adopted. Thus after these conventions were established, there will be no question of priority or posteriority of a practice: therefore when we say that the first practice was earlier in point of time, we say with reference to the original practices.

URMILA DAVE

The Ten Incarnations of Viṣṇu in Bengal

Antiquity of Avatāravāda

The *Avatāravāda* of Viṣṇu, current in ancient Bengal, can be traced in the Vedic and other sacred literatures of the remote days. The *Avatāra* theory is of very early origin, though the ten or more incarnations of *Avatāras* cannot be traced back to a very ancient date.

In the *Bhagavadgītā*, IV, 8 appears the following stanza:

परित्राणाय साधूनां विनाशाय च दुष्कृताम् ।

धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय सम्भवामि युगे युगे ॥

'For the protection and preservation of the virtuous and also for the destruction of the wicked, I (Viṣṇu) incarnate myself from age to age.'

The germ of the Pauranik myth of the Dwarf incarnation can be traced in the *R̥gveda*: त्रिणिपदा विचक्रमे विष्णुर्गोपा अदाभ्यः । (*R̥k.* 1, 22, 18).

Viṣṇu is known in the hymns of the *R̥gveda* by his three steps.¹ The mythology of this *Vāmana Avatāra* is found in a developed form in the *Brāhmaṇas*, e.g. *Satapatha*² it is related that the demons having defeated the gods wanted to divide the earth among themselves. The gods requested the Asuras to give them only a very small share of the earth on which Viṣṇu the sacrifice, in the form of the Dwarf, could lie on. The Asuras agreed to it. Viṣṇu conquered the whole world for the gods by covering the earth, the air and the heaven by means of his three strides. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*³ and the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*⁴ relate the same story.

The names of the Varāha, Matsya, Kurma, and Nṛsiṃha Avatāras appear in the *Brāhmaṇas* and *Āraṇyakas*. They are not as yet directly connected with Viṣṇu. In the opinion of Prof. Macdonell,⁵ two hymns of the *R̥gveda* (1, 61; 8, 66) contain the germs of the Varāha legend, where boar is called *Emūṣaṃ*. The *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*⁶ refers to this in connection with Prajāpati. It is related in the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*⁷ that the earth

1 *RV.*, 6, 49, 7; 1, 155; 6, 69. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 156.

2 *Sat. Br.*, 1, 9, 3, 1, 2, 5; *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. 12, Mac., p. 41.

3 *AB.*, 6, 15.

4 *TS.*, 1, 6, 1.

5 *P.* 41.

6 *TS.*, 7, 1, 5.

7 *S. Br.*, 14, 1, 2.

is raised up by the *Emūṣaṃ* from the waters. The *T.Br.*⁸ also preserves this legend in a developed form.

The legend of the Fish which saved Manu from the Great Deluge is first introduced by the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.⁹ It also relates how Prajāpati assumed the form of a tortoise in order to create all creatures of this universe (*Ś.Br.* 7, 5, 1). The *Atharvaveda*,¹⁰ the *Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā*¹¹ have made the tortoise a semi-divine animal, often identical with Prajāpati. The *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* first mentions the Nṛsiṃha *Avatāra*

Now we come to the Epic and the Pauranic period. The Nārāyaṇīya section of the *Mahābhārata* contains three lists of the *Avatāras*.¹² Verses 339, 77-90 give the names of *Varāha*, *Narasimha*, *Vāmana*, *Rāma*, *Bhārgava*, *Rāma-Dāśarathī*, and *Kṛṣṇa*. In verses 339, 104 the *Avatāras* of Viṣṇu are mentioned thus:

हंस कुर्मश्च मतस्यश्च प्रादुर्भव द्विजोत्तम ।

वराह नरसिंहश्च वामन राम एव च ।

राम दासरथीश्चैव सात्वतः कल्किरेव च ।

But in *Mbb.* xii, 349, 37 the *Avatāras* are *Varāha*, *Narasimha*, *Vāmana* and *Vāsudeva*. The *Harivaṃśa*¹³ relates the exploits of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu first and then mentions *Haṃsa*, *Kurma*, *Matsya*, *Varāha*, *Nṛsiṃha*, *Vāmana*, two *Rāmas*, *Kṛṣṇa*, *Kalki*, *Buddha*.

All the existing Purāṇas do not give the same list of the *Avatāras*. The *Matsya* in the 47th chapter describes the incarnations in the following manner. Viṣṇu, who is the protector of the world, incarnates himself as the son of Devakī and Vāsudeva and the foster son of Nanda and Yaśodā, who kills Kaṃsa. *Matsya*, *Varāha*, *Narasimha*, *Vāmana* are the celestial incarnations. The seven human *Avatāras* are *Dattātreya*, *Māṇḍhātṛi*, *Paraśurāma*, *Rāma*, *Vedavyāsa*, *Buddha*, and *Kalki* in the *Kali yuga*.

In the *Varāha Purāṇa*¹⁴ and the *Agni*¹⁵ the names of the incarnations are *Matsya*, *Kurma*, *Varāha*, *Narasimha*, *Vāmana*, *Paraśurāma*, *Rāma*, *Kṛṣṇa*, *Buddha*, and *Kalki*. The above-mentioned ten incarnations are more popular than Viṣṇu's other *Avatāras* given in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* in Bengal.

8 *TB.*, 1, 1, 3.

10 *AV.*, 19, 53.

12 *Mbb.*, XII, 349, 37; 339, 77-90; 399, 104. Calcutta edition.

13 Cal. edition, pp. 62-69.

15 *Ibid.*, Chs. 1-16.

9 *Ś. Br.*, 1, 8, 1.

11 *VS.*, 13, 31.

14 Cal. edition, p. 12.

Epigraphic evidences

The extant epigraphic evidences show that the *Avatāra* theory was current in Bengal and outside this province during the reign of early Gupta kings. The Junagadh Inscription,¹⁶ the Eran Boar Inscription of the time of Toramana¹⁷ and an image of *Varāha Avatāra* belonging to c. 400 A.D. discovered from Udayagiri cave at Bhopal (Plate xlv)¹⁸ bear testimony to the fact. The Damodarpur Plate¹⁹ of the G.E. 214 tells us that a Kula-putra made donation of lands for the repairs of the temple of the god *Sveta Varāha Svāmin*.

Outside Bengal sculptural representations of this *Varāha* incarnation belonging to the 6th-7th centuries A.D. have been discovered at Badami, Central Provinces, Mahabalipuram and Marwar.²⁰

In the Pāla period the *Avatāra* theory was not unknown. In verse 2 of the *Bāṅgaḍḍḥ lipi* of Mahīpāla²¹ it is written that Viṣṇu could bear the burden of the earth. This act he did in the form of a boar. The *Kamauli lipi* of Vaidyadeva begins with an invocation of Hari in the form of *Varāha*.

Viṣṇupattas or slabs with representations of Viṣṇu with his wives on one side and those of the ten incarnations on the other were discovered from various parts of East Bengal. The Taṅgibāḍi slab has the representations of *Matsya*, *Kurma*, *Varāha*, *Nṛsimha*, *Vāmana*, *Rāma*, *Paraśurāma*, *Balarāma*, *Buddha* and *Kalki* on horse-back. The Vikrampur slab contains the sculptures of the ten incarnations in similar order. The Raghurampur slab depicts Trivikrama form in place of Paraśurāma. Another slab from the same place represents *Matsya*, *Kurma*, *Varāha*, *Nṛsimha*, *Vāmana* (in the *Trivikrama* form, with uplifted leg to the sky), *Paraśurāma* (holding a club and not an axe), *Rāma*, *Buddha*, and *Kalki*. There is no representation of *Balarāma*.

16 Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 62. "who, for the sake of the happiness of the lord of the gods, seized back from Bali, the goddess of wealth and splendour."

17 *Ibid.*, pp. 160, 161. "Om! victorious is the god, who has the form of a Boar, who, in the act of lifting up the earth, caused the mountains to tremble with the blows of (his) hard snout."

18 Coomaraswamy, *Hist. of Indian and Indonesian Art*, pp. 85, 100.

19 *El.*, vol. XV.

20 Rao, *Hindu Iconography*, vol. I, pt. I, Pls. XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, Fig. 2.

21 *Gaudalekhamālā*, pp. 91-100.

In the slab No. 3A(1)c/5 has only two representations of *Rāma* with an arrow and *Paraśurāma*.²²

The stone slabs discovered from Dinajpur district contain the figures of *Nṛsiṃha*, *Vāmana*, *Rāma*, *Balarāma*, *Paraśurāma* and *Buddha*.^{22a}

Some of the Viṣṇu images discovered from various parts of Bengal^{22b} contain the miniature representations of the ten incarnations, viz., *Matsya*, *Kurma*, *Varāha*, *Nṛsiṃha*, *Vāmana*, *Rāma*, *Paraśurāma*, *Balarāma*, *Buddha* and *Kalki*.

On the basis of these evidences it may be stated that in Bengal *Avatāra-vāda* was known from very early times. Epigraphic evidences testify to the existence of this theory from the 5th century A.D. onwards.

(i) *Varāha*

The *Rāmacaritam* of Abhinanda²³ belonging to cira 900 A.D. describes in the 9th sarga *Matsya*, *Kurma*, *Varāha*, *Nṛsiṃha*, *Vāmana*, *Paraśurāma*, *Rāma* and several other forms of Viṣṇu. In verses 39, 40 it relates that Hari in the form of *Ādi-Varāha* raised the earth with his task like a lotus-bud and killed *Hiraṇyākṣa*. The *Rāmacaritam* of Sandhyākara Nandi²⁴ (verse 5) describes *Lakṣmipati* in the form of *Ādi-Varāha* as the rescuer of the earth. The Belava Plate²⁵ of Bhojavarmān and the *Bluvaneśvara* Inscription²⁶ refer to the *Varāha* Incarnation of Viṣṇu as the upholder of the Earth.

Vaṭudāsa,²⁷ father of *Śrīdharadāsa*, compiler of the anthology of *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*, was a devout worshipper of *Ādi-Varāha*. There are several verses quoted in this Anthology, compiled in Bengal in 1205-6 A.D. in praise of *Varāha Avatāra*. The *Mahābhārata*, III, 142 refers to the legend of *Varāha* incarnation as the uplifter of Earth which had gone down under the water due to the great weight of the population. In the *Agni*, ch. 4, and *Matsya*, ch. 47, it is related that *Hiraṇyākṣa* having vanquished all the gods, was dwelling in the *Surapura*. Then the gods went to Viṣṇu and prayed to him to rescue them from this danger. He in the form of *Varāha* slew the

22 *DM. Cat.*, p. 90 ft. 22a *VRS. Cat.*, p. 22. 22b *DM. Cat.*, p. 78.

23 *Gaekwad's Oriental Series*, No. XLVI.

24 Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Dr. Basak & Mr. N. G. Banerjee's edition.

25 & 26 N. G. Majumdar, *Inscriptions of Bengal*, vol. 3.

27 *The Punjab Oriental Series*, No. 15.

Daitya with all his followers. According to the *Vāyu*, ch. 6, Brahmā in the form of Nārāyaṇa, remained lying on the vast expanse of the waters and recalled to mind the *Varāha* form of Hari, whose colour was white, and whose tusk was sharp and brilliant for recovering the universe from water. *Varāha* went down to the nether region and raised the submerged Earth.

The popularity of the *Varāha Avatāra* of Viṣṇu is evident from the discovery of a large number of images in Bengal proper. Five or six specimens of the deity belonging to the period between the 10th and the 12th centuries A.D. were discovered from various parts of East Bengal.²⁸ Three or four specimens of this sculpture are in the Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣad Museum.²⁹ They were obtained from Murshidabad and Burdwan districts. There are also several representations of *Varāha* preserved in the Rajshahi Museum.³⁰

The *Matsya*³¹ (260th chapter) gives direction for the making of the images of *Mahā Varāha*: "Lotus and club should be placed in the hands of *Varāha*, the teeth should be sharp, and at the left elbow should be placed the World uplifted by the teeth from the *Pātāla*.....the right foot should be on the turtle, the left foot on the head of the *Śeṣa* and right hand is to be placed on his left *śakti*. All round the image should be made the images of the *Lokapālas* in praying posture." The *Agni*, in ch. 49 says that *Varāha* should be made like a man with the face of a Boar. He should hold *Śaṅkha*, *Cakra*, *Gadā*, and *Padma*. On the right and the left sides *Śaṅkha*, *Lakṣmī* or *Padma* should be represented. On the right and the left elbow *Śrī* should be placed and the Earth goddess and Ananta should remain between the two feet.

The *Varāha* images of Bengal resemble the *Dhyānas* given in the *Matsya* and the *Agni Purāṇa* in many points. They were made in Bengal in the following way:—The *Ādi Varāha* is sculptured as a man with the face of a boar who has four hands, holding *Śaṅkha*, *Cakra*, *Gadā* and *Padma*. On the upper left elbow the Earth goddess is represented as seated there. *Varāha* is turning his face towards her. *Lakṣmī* is on the right side of the deity standing, while on the left side is the goddess *Sarasvatī*. The *Nāga Śeṣa* is touching the right foot, and his wife, the left foot of the

28 *Dacca Museum Catalogue*, pp. 103ff.

29 *VSPM, Cat.*, pp. 66ff.

30 *VRSM, Cat.*, pp. 21ff., 1919 edition.

31 *Sacred Books of the Hindus*, vol. 17, pt. II, p. 308.

god. Garuḍa is beneath the lotus pedestal. The deity is represented as standing. In some images, as for example the image from Dacca districts,³² a small boar in the posture of digging up the Earth with his tusk is represented between the two legs of the god. *Varāha* images from North Bengal are represented in similar manner.³³

The Jhilli (Murshidabad district) specimen³⁴ is represented as wearing a Kirīṭa. Nāga is covering the head of the deity by the three hoods of a serpent. The left foot of the god rests on the full blown lotus held by the serpent-hooded Nāgiṇī. The *Varāha* with the body of a man is shown as standing on the serpent coils of a Nāga and a Nāgiṇī supported by a lotus pedestal, in the Alidha or athlete pose. The goddess Earth and a boar are represented as remaining on the coils between the feet of the deity who is carrying in his upper and lower right hands Cakra and Gadā and the lower left hand holds Śaṅkha. He is bending his upper left hand with the elbow pointing upwards; on the palm of the left upper hand there is a lotus. This image is, according to Hemādri and *Agnī*, Hṛṣikeśa, and according to the *Padma*, Śrīdhara. Garuḍa is depicted on the pedestal.

The images of *Varāha Avatāras* found at Bchar³⁵ are similar in representations to those of Bengal. The peculiarity of the Cave No. III, Badami images³⁶ consists in the representation of the Devi Earth standing on the palm of the left hand of the standing figure of *Varāha*, who is surrounded by *Brahmā* and *Śiva* with their consorts, in the posture of adoration. This deity was not only popular in Bengal, but extant images of this deity belonging to this period, are discovered from various parts of India.³⁷ This deity is very popular in the early Pallava sculpture.³⁸ In the 9th century A.D., Bhoja's biruda was *Ādi-Varāha*.³⁹ All these sculptures mentioned above are more or less represented in the same form.

(ii) *Vāmana*

The mythology of *Vāmana Avatāra* was known in ancient Bengal. Outside this country, images of this *Avatāra* from Badami, Mahabali-

³² *DM. Cat.*, p. 106.

³³ *VRS. Cat.*, p. 21.

³⁴ *VSPC.*, F. (6), 385, Pl. XIV.

³⁵ *Sup. Indian Museum Cat.*, pp. 83-84. *Hindu Iconography*, vol. I, pt. I, pl. XXXIX, fig. 3.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pl. XXXVII.

³⁷ *Eran, Bhitari, Khoh in Nagod State. C.P. Mem. Ar. Sur.*, No. 23. XXXVII; *Ann. Rep. W. Circle 1920*, pl. XXIX.

³⁸ *Hindu Icon.*, vol. I, pt. I.

³⁹ *Mem. Ar. Sur.*, No. 11.

puram, Raipur, Ellora,⁴⁰ assignable to the 6th-8th century A.D. indicate the popularity of this *Avatāra*.

Abhinanda's book *Rāmacaritam* (9th century A.D.) gives us glimpse of the myth prevalent in Bengal. In the 9th sarga, 44, it is written that Viṣṇu delivered the king of gods, Indra, from the fear of Vairocana. The Pāla inscriptions in Bengal do not contain any reference to this *Avatāra*, but the Monghyr Inscription of Devapāladeva in verse 14 and the Bhagalpur Inscription of Nārāyaṇa Pāla in verse 3 refer to this myth: 'In the days gone by, king Bali, after he obtained possession of the worlds by his victory over Indra and other enemies, made over all these as a gift to Viṣṇu in the form of the Dwarf'.⁴¹ The *Rāmacaritam* of Sandhyākaranandin in ch. 1, v. 2B, 12, mentions Viṣṇu as the destroyer of the demon Bali.

There are inscriptional references to the *Vāmana* incarnation in the Sena Period. The Anulia Copper Plate,⁴² v. 10; the Madhainagar Copper Plate, v. 7 state "Even Bali was dissuaded by his friends from parting with these, when he was distributing the three worlds", and "the earth was covered by the foot-steps of the Dwarf". The *Gīta Govinda* of Jayadeva refers to the *Vāmana* Incarnation. 'Viṣṇu in the form of the Dwarf deceived Bali, and the water issuing forth from his toe-nails purified the whole world'. The *Saduktikaṇāmṛta*⁴³ sings eulogy of *Vāmana* and *Trivikrama*.

The legend of the *Vāmana* incarnation is as follows:—Bali was a devout worshipper of *Nṛsiṃha Viṣṇu*. He was the son of Virocana and grandson of Prahlāda. Bali became so powerful that he defeated all the gods by means of his extraordinary strength gained by his devotion to *Viṣṇu*. As a result of his fierce conflict, Indra lost his domain. Aditi, the mother of gods, practised hard penance in order to beget *Viṣṇu* as her son so that he could restore to Indra his lost kingdom. *Viṣṇu* was born as the son of Aditi in the form of a Dwarf. Meanwhile Bali was performing a great sacrifice. *Vāmana* having gone to see the sacrifice, asked Bali for a small land which could be measured by the three steps of his feet. Śukrācārya, the spiritual guide of the Asuras, attempted to prevent Bali to consent to this proposal, informing him that the *Vāmana* was no other person than *Viṣṇu* himself. Bali did not listen to his words and gladly

40 *Hindu Iconography*, p. 172, pl. L, pl. XLIX, pl. XLVIII, plate II.

41 *Gauḍalekhamālā*, pp. 33-44; 55-69.

42 *Ins. of Bengal*, vol. 3, pp. 90, 114.

43 P. 33; 1, v. 43, 44.

agreed to this request. By his two steps *Vāmana* covered the earth and the heaven and his third step was placed on the royal head of Bali, whom he sent to the Nether region, there to be the king over the Asuras. *Viṣṇu* thus recovered the lost possession of Indra and made over to him.¹¹ It is given in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*,¹² 8th skandha, ch. 21 that after *Vāmana*'s covering of the three worlds by his three steps, Brahmā came to the spot where sacrifice was being performed. He worshipped *Viṣṇu* by offering waters taken from his Kamaṇḍalu to *Viṣṇu*'s feet. The waters of the Kamaṇḍalu of Vidhātā which washed the feet of *Viṣṇu* became a sacred river still sanctifying the whole world.

There are three images of this incarnation preserved in the Dacca Museum.⁴⁶ The *Matsya*¹⁷ gives directions for the construction of *Vāmana* image. The image of the Dwarf incarnation is to be represented as holding a goblet in the left hand and a small umbrella in the right, in the form of a *Vāmana*. This is to be depicted in the lower part of the figure. In the upper part, the image should have arms by the side of his legs raised upwards. The Lord should have extremely meek and appealing appearance. The *Agni* in chapter 49 describes the *Vāmana* image as '*chatrī daṇḍī vāmanaḥ syāt athavā syāt caturbhujah*' (*Vāmana* should have the shape of a dwarf with umbrella over his head, a staff in hand. He should also be made four armed).

The *Vāmana* image¹⁸ from Munshiganja, Dacca district is figured with four arms bearing *Cakra*, *Gadā*, *Padma*, and *Śaṅkha* in four hands. The left leg is raised towards the sky. There is a figure of a four-armed god Brahmā over this leg. The other leg is placed on the pedestal. The deity is not holding either umbrella or a goblet. The scene of Bali's gift is represented below. The image from *Rāmpāl*¹⁹ is with an upraised leg, holding *Cakra*, *Gadā*, *Padma* and *Śaṅkha*, attended by his two wives. It has an inscription of the 11-12th century character reading *Namo Vāmanāya*.

(iii) *Narasimha*

The *Narasimha* incarnation was worshipped in Bengal from the Gupta period. It is evident from the Damodarpur Copper Plate Grant of Budha

44 *Mbb.*, XII, 339-79.

46 Pp. 105-106.

48 *DM. Cat.*, pl. XXXVIII 3A (1) d/3, against p. 105

45 Calcutta edition.

47 Ch. 260 Cal. edition.

49 *Ibid.*, p. 107.

Gupta⁵⁰ which tells us of the erection of the temple and the installation of the image of *Kokāmukha Svāmi*, the lion-faced god.

The *Matsya* writes that in the Man-lion incarnation, *Viṣṇu* slew the daitya *Hiraṇyakaśipu*.⁵¹ The story of *Prahlāda*'s devotion to *Viṣṇu* and killing of his father is very popular. After his brother *Hiraṇyākṣa*'s death at the hand of *Viṣṇu* in the Boar form, the demon king became a bitter enemy of the god *Hari*. He practised great austerities in honour of *Brahma* and obtained a boon from him. He vanquished *Indra* and drove away all the gods from the heaven through the strength acquired by his devotion to *Brahmā*. But *Prahlāda*, the son of *Hiraṇyakaśipu*, was a devout worshipper of *Viṣṇu*. His father tried his utmost to murder his rebellious son but failed to do so. *Prahlāda* was saved from all danger by his deity. In the long run *Hiraṇyakaśipu* was killed by the Man-lion in which form the god incarnated himself in order to liberate the world from the oppression of the *Asuras*.

One image of *Narasimha* belonging to the 7th-8th century A.D. has been discovered from the 24-Parganas.⁵² *Kāntideva*'s Copper Plate (verse 6) refers to *Viṣṇu* in his *Narasimha* incarnation, the slayer of the demons and *Hiraṇyakaśipu*,⁵³ assignable to the 8th century A.D. Outside Bengal images of this incarnation were discovered from *Badami*, *Ellora* etc.

In the 9th century A.D. the *Narasimha* legend appeared to be a favourite myth in Bengal. In the 9th sarga, v. 41-44 of the *Rāmacaritam* of *Abhinanda* it is mentioned that *Hiraṇyakaśipu* was killed by the Man-lion by tearing open the breast of the demon by his finger-nails. In v. 19 of the chapter on 'Kaviprasasti', *Sandhyākaranandi* refers to the Man-lion-incarnation. Verse 29 of the *Bhuvanēśvar lipi* of *Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva* records the installation of the image of *Nṛsiṃha*. The *Govindapur Plate* and the *Madhainagar Grant* describe *Lakṣmaṇa Sena* as *Parama-Nārasimha*, the devout worshipper of *Viṣṇu* in his Man-lion incarnation.

The *Gīta Govinda* mentions *Narasimha Avatāra* as *Viṣṇu* who manifested as Man-lion, tore into pieces the body of *Hiraṇyakaśipu* with his pointed nails. The *Saduktikarnāmrta* quotes verses in honour of *Narasimha Avatāra*.

Nṛsiṃha images belonging to the *Pāla* and the *Sena* periods have been discovered from the districts of *Dacca*, *Dinajpur*, *Rajshahi* and other parts

50 *E.I.*, vol. XV. 51 *Matsya*, ch. 47; the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, 7th skandha.

52 *Ar. Sur. Rep.* 1926-27, p. 209.

53 *Modern Review*, 1922.

of Bengal. According to the *Matsya*, ch. 260, "Narasimha is to be represented as tearing open the breast of the demon with his finger nails. The blood is depicted as gushing out of the mouth of the demon. The deity should look terrible with an angry lion's head and his mane is standing on end. He will be light armed fighting with some tired demons. The gods are to be depicted as praising him". The Bengal images agree in the main with the directions given by the *Matsya*. But the deity is four-armed, with his two hands he is in the act of opening the entrails of the demon. The other two are carved in the Abhaya and Tarjjanī postures. The image from Rāmpāl has on the left side the representation of "the scene of *Hiraṇyakaśipu* expostulating with Prahlāda and the emergence of the Man-lion from the Pillar kicked by *Hiraṇyakaśipu*" on the right side.⁵⁴ The four images of *Narasimha* which are preserved at Abdullapur, Taṅgibari, in Dacca district resemble the Rāmpāl image in all respects save that they are six-armed. The *V.R.S.M.*⁵⁵ images follow the Rāmpāl image in all details. They are four-armed, tearing with two hands the abdomen of the demon. The scene of *Narasimha* coming out of the pillar is depicted on the right side. Like the Dacca image a crowned prostrate male figure is under his left leg.

(iv) *Matsya*

In Bengal representations of the three *Avatāras*: *Vāmana*, *Varāha* and *Nṛsiṃha* were more numerous than the other *Avatāras*. The *Matsya* and the *Kurma* incarnations are not very popular in Bengal. This is evident from the paucity of the separate representations of these two. It has already been mentioned that the fish legend is referred to in the *Mahābhārata*, the *Matsya*, *Agni*, and *Bhāgavata*.

Once *Vaiśvata Manu*, the first king of the solar dynasty, was pouring water as *Tarpaṇa* or libation to the manes of his deceased ancestors, a tiny *saphari* fish came into his hand along with the water. He kept first the small fish in his water-jar. It began to grow larger so that it was put into a bigger vessel. Within a short time it assumed the immense size extending to sixteen hundred miles, so the fish had to be placed in the ocean, from the Ganges water. The king became surprised and asked about

54 *DM. Cat.*, pp. 106-10.

55 *VRSM. Cat.*

its identity. The fish revealed its true nature as the god Viṣṇu to him and predicted that there would be a Deluge or *Pralaya* of the universe. He ordered Manu to get into a boat with five kinds of animals, which should be fastened to the horn of the fish. Thus at the beginning of the Deluge the king fastened the boat to the horn of the fish with *Śeṣa* who came before him in the shape of a rope. Thus Manu was saved by the Fish from the Great Deluge.

Abhinanda praises this *Avatāra* in ch. 9, 38 of his book. In his *Gīta Govinda* Jayadeva speaks devotionally of Viṣṇu who incarnated himself as *Matsya* at the time of the Great Destruction and rescued the Vedas. This act of the Fish, i.e. the recovery of the Vedas is also mentioned by Abhinanda (9th century A.D.). An image of the Fish incarnation of exquisite artistic merit was found at Vajrayogini, Dacca dt.⁵⁶ The *Agni* says about the images of *Matsya* as “*Matsyākāraḥ tu matsyaḥ syāt*” (49 ch.)

The image of *Matsya* may either be represented as an ordinary fish, or in the form of half-man and half-fish. It is generally depicted with four hands, two of which should hold the *Śaṅkha* and *Cakra*, and the other two should display the *Varadā* and *Abhaya* poses.⁵⁷ The Dacca image is depicted as half-man in the upper portion, and the lower portion is that of a fish. The *Padma*, *Cakra*, *Gadā*, *Śaṅkha* are placed in his four hands. He is attended on his right side by *Lakṣmī* with a fruit and lotus in the right and left hands and on the left side by *Sarasvatī* playing on her *Viṇā*.

(v) *Kūrma*

The *Mahābbhārata*, the *Kurma Purāṇa*, ch. I and the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* relate that the mountain *Mandāra* was held on the back of Viṣṇu in the form of a Tortoise at the time of churning the ocean.

The *Vīradeva Prasāsti* (v. 6) mentions this *Avatāra*.⁵⁸ Abhinanda says that as a *Kurma* Viṣṇu holds the earth (9, 38).

Jayadeva speaks of this incarnation as the earth rests on the back of Viṣṇu who manifests himself in the shape of *Kurma*. These two *Avatāras* are generally represented in the *Dāśāvatāra* slabs and on the sides of the Viṣṇu images found in Bengal.

⁵⁶ DMC., p. 105.

⁵⁷ *Hindu Iconography*, vol. I, pt. 1, p. 125.

⁵⁸ *Gaudalekhamāṭā*, p. 54.

(vi) *Paraśu-rāma*

In the next incarnation Viṣṇu manifested himself as *Paraśu-rāma*. The *Agni* (ch. 4) gives the story of this *Avatāra* as follows:—

In the days gone by, the Kṣatriyas became very obstinate and haughty. For curbing down their arrogance Hari, the protector of the Devas and Brāhmaṇas, was born as the son of Renukā and Yamadagni in the Bhṛgu clan. He became known as *Paraśu-rāma*, whose symbol was *Paraśu* or battle axe. Meanwhile the king Kārta-vīrya gained a thousand arms through the favour of Dattātreya and established his suzerainty over the whole world. *Paraśu-rāma* cut off the head of this king while he was taking away the Kāmadhenu of his father. One day, while Yāmadagna was absent from the hermitage, the sons of the king came there and killed his father. This news enraged *Paraśu-rāma* to such an extent that he exterminated the Kṣatriyas twentyone times from the face of the earth and offered libations to his deceased father with the blood of these Kṣatriyas in the Kurukṣetra. The *Mahābhārata*, the *Viṣṇu*, *Vāyu*, *Bhāgavata* etc. contain this legend.

From the inscriptions in Bengal it is evident that the story about *Paraśu-rāma* was prevalent in Bengal. In the 18th verse of the *Garuḍa stambha lipi*,⁵⁹ it is written that 'Śrī Gurava' Miśra is like *Paraśu-rāma* who was the destroyer of the wealthy Kṣatriyas. The *Rāmacaritam* of Abhinanda mentions *Paraśu-rāma* (9th sarga) as one of the *Avatāras* of Viṣṇu.

The Naihati Copper Plate of Vallāla Sena (v. 9) refers to "King *Kārta-vīrya*, who (it is said) had to drive to every house, holding bow (in hand), in order to smother rebellious spirit.....".

The *Rāmacaritam* of Sandhyākaranandi refers to *Paraśu-rāma* as the destroyer of the Kṣatriyas twentyone times and the enemy of the thousand-armed Kārtavīrya. (1, v. 29).

In the *Gīta Govinda* of Jayadeva, *Paraśu-rāma* is praised in these words: Viṣṇu, incarnated as *Paraśu-rāma*, the Lord of the Bhṛgus, flooded the earth with the blood of the Kṣatriyas and thus washed off the sin from the face of this world.

The images of *Paraśu-rāma* according to the *Agni* (ch. 49) should be represented as holding the *Paraśu*, *Khaḍga*, *Bāṇa* and *Dhanu*. But the image discovered at Ranihati⁶⁰ is sculptured as standing in the *Tribhaṅga*

pose carrying in his four hands the Padma, Paraśu, Śaṅkha and Cakra. Garuḍa is seen as kneeling at the bottom.

(vii) *Rāma*

The seventh incarnation of Viṣṇu is Rāma, son of Daśaratha. Like the Kṛṣṇa cult, Rāma cult was very popular in Bengal and is still a living cult in the other parts of Northern India. In the opinion of Dr. Bhandarkar Rāma cult was of late origin (11th century A.D.). But the story of the heroic exploits of Rāma was known to the Indians from a very remote period as is evidenced by the Epics and the Purāṇas.

The Eran Stone Inscription of Samudra Gupta⁶¹, the Gangadhar Stone Inscription of Viśvavarman G.E. 480 mention the name of Rāma.⁶² Representations of the scene of Rāma's life have been found at Sirpur in C.P. and at Ellora.⁶³ The Jaina work *Dharmaparīkṣā Amitagatī* (V.S. 1070 = 1014 A.D.) refers to the Rāma cult.⁶⁴

In Bengal the prevalence of the mythology of Rāma incarnation was found in the 6th century A.D. The Pāhārpur excavation reveals the existence of the representations of the episode of the *Rāmāyaṇa* together with those relating to Kṛṣṇa cult.⁶⁵

The artists of Pāhārpur had taken a great delight in carving in stones and plaques the episodes of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The *Rāmāyaṇa* panel at Deogadh also belongs to this period⁶⁶ (circa 600 A.D.). The Chittagong Plate of Kāntideva refers to the epic *Rāmāyaṇa*. From the Khalimpur Inscription of Dharmapāla it appears that Rāma was held in high respect in ancient Bengal (v. 10). The Monghyr *lipi* of Devapāladeva mentions (v. 15) the 'Setubandha'—the stone bridge made by Rāmacandra over the ocean as his famous achievement. The third verse of the *Bānagaḍh lipi* of Mahīpāla speaks of Rāma as the keeper of the vow of truth and Lakṣmaṇa as his younger brother and the son of Sumitrā. The *Garuḍa-stambha lipi* and the *Kamauli lipi* of Vaidyadeva refers to the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.⁶⁷

Besides these evidences, the two *Rāmacaritam* belonging to the 9th and the 11th century A.D. and the book written by *Abhinanda*⁶⁸ flourishing in

61 Fleet, *Gupta Ins.*, p. 18.

62 *Ibid.*, p. 77.

63 *Ar. S.R. Western Circle*, 1903-4, p. 21; Bhandarkar, p. 45.

64 Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism*, p. 46.

65 *Mem. Ar. Sur.*, No. 55; p. 51.

66 Coomaraswamy, *Hist. of Indian and Indonesian Art*, Fig. 167.

67 *Gaudālekhamālā*.

68 *Gaekwads Oriental Series*, No. XLVI, p. xvii.

the early Pāla period, shows clearly that in the 9th century A.D. Rāma was accepted as one of the *Avatāras* of Viṣṇu (9th sarga).

During the Sena rule Rāma legend was popular. The Deopārā Inscription of Vijayasenā speaks of.....the son of Daśaratha.....and refers to the bridge built by him over the ocean; (v. 5) and in v. 17 mentions Rāma as 'the leader of the numberless soldiers of the monkey king,' and in v. 23 refers to Vālmiki. The Edilpur Plate mentions the ten-headed Rāvaṇa (v. 4). The *Gīta Govinda* describes Rāma as the destroyer of Rāvaṇa while the *Saduktikarnāmṛta* in v. 46 speaks of Śrī Rāma.

From Ganespur, Rajshahi Dt., an image of Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Sitā (No. 1526) belonging to the Pāla period was discovered. Rāma is represented as standing on a low plinth held by Hanumān. Rāma carries a bow. Lakṣmaṇa is standing to his right, with a bow and an arrow. On the left side Sitā is represented as standing, holding a rosary of beads and a lotus.⁶⁹

(viii) Balarāma

Kṛṣṇa⁷⁰ and Balarāma are regarded as the eighth incarnation of Viṣṇu. The Pāhārpur sculptures relating to Kṛṣṇa cult remove all our doubts regarding the existence of this cult in Bengal. Here Balarāma had his representations in the scene referring to the exploits of Kṛṣṇa. Only one specimen of a four-armed figure of Balarāma holding a wine cup and plough-share is depicted here.⁷¹

Sandhyākaranandin describes Balarāma thus: (*R.C.* IV, v. 27 & v. 28):

"Balarāma, impetuous in his strength, snatched away wine from the mouth of his dear one (Revatī); and on account of the insolence of his enemies, his weapon, (the formidable) plough-share was led through the river Yamunā, overcoming its hostile waves; and a human form in distress (which was assumed by the river Yamunā) was dragged near himself.⁷² "Balarāma, again put on a dark blue garment; his another name was Madanapāla; he was the maintainer of the creation (being an incarnation of Viṣṇu) and was attached to his consort (Revatī)."

S.M. (I, v. 48) refers to Haladhara while the *Gīta Govinda* (IV, v. 23) mentions Haladhara.

69 *VRS. Ann. Rep.*, 1934-35.

70 The cult of this Incarnation of Viṣṇu will be dealt in a separate article.

71 *Mem. Ar. Sur. Rep. Pāhārpur* No. 55.

72 The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, 10th skandha.

One image of Balarāma was found from Dt. Dinajpur. The deity is depicted as standing in a *tribhaṅga* pose under a tri-folio arch. There are representations of five serpent hoods behind the four-armed god, who is holding a cup of wine and a club in the first right hand and the second hand and a plough in the first left hand and the other hand rested on the knee.⁷³

Another image of Balarāma is discovered from Vikrampur, Dacca district.⁷⁴ This is a very fine representation of this deity. The image appears to belong to an early period.

The *Agni Purāṇa* in ch. 49 gives the dhyāna of Balarāma in these words:

गदा लाङ्गलधारी रामः वा अथ चतुर्भुजः ।

वामर्धे लाङ्गलं दद्यात् अथः शङ्खं सुशोभनम् ॥

मुषलं दक्षिणोर्ध्वे तु चक्रं च अथः सुशोभनम् ।

In the four hands of Balarāma, a plough and Śaṅkha in the upper and the lower left and Muṣala and Cakra in the upper and lower right are to be placed.

In the present image Balarāma is represented as standing in *tribhaṅga* pose, wearing a long garland, mukuṭa and other ornaments, accompanied by Lakṣmī carrying lotus stalk in the left hand and the right hand in Varadā pose, on the right side, and Sarasvati playing on Vīṇā. Garuḍa is kneeling below. The deity is holding a Plough in the normal right and Gadā in the upper right hands and Śaṅkha and Cakra in the normal and upper left hands respectively. Two Vidyādhara are flying above.

(ix) Buddha

Buddha is regarded by the Hindus as one of the *Avatāras* of Viṣṇu, viz. the ninth incarnation of Viṣṇu. The *Matsya* whose date is placed in the 3rd century A.D. according to Mr. Pargiter⁷⁵ mentions Buddha as an *Avatāra*. Several other *Purāṇas* mention this.⁷⁶ There are sculptures representing Buddha as one of the incarnations of Viṣṇu e.g., at Sirpur belonging to the 8th century A.D. The *Dharmapañkṣā Amitagīti* refers to Buddha as one of Viṣṇu's *Avatāras*.⁷⁷ It can safely be presumed that during the Gupta

⁷³ *VRS. Cat.*, p. 23.

⁷⁴ The photograph of this image is with Dr. N. K. Bhattasali, Dacca Museum. He has very kindly allowed me to use this

⁷⁵ *The Dynasties of Kali age.*

⁷⁶ Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism*, p. 46.

⁷⁷ Vide ante.

period which is characterized as the age of the revival of the Brahmanic faith and the rise of the Purāṇic religion Buddha began to lose his individuality and within a short time he was admitted into the Brahmanic pantheon.

Then *Agni* gives directions for the making of images of Buddha. Buddha should be made calm in appearance, white in colour and seated on a lotus pedestal.

The *Gīta Govinda* relates that Hari manifested Himself as Buddha for removing the evil of killing animals at the sacrifice. The *S.M.* includes Buddha in the list of the ten *Avatāras*.

(x) *Kalki*

Kalki is described in the Epics and the Purāṇas as the tenth incarnation of Viṣṇu who will be born as the son of a Brāhmaṇa for the punishment of the infidels. From the *Gīta Govinda* and the *Sadukti* it is evident that Kalki was included already in the list of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu in Bengal.

In the *Agni*, the image is described thus: Kalki is to be placed on a horse-back holding Bow, Quiver, Sword, Conch-shell, Disc and Arrow.

KAMALA RAY

MISCELLANY

Firuz Shah Tughluq as a Ruler

On his accession to the throne of Delhi in 732 H. (Oct. 1331 to Sept. 1332 A.D.) Sultan Firuz Tughluq put a stop to capital and other severe punishments and imparted justice to the people. He became the indulgent nursing-father to his people. He was no respecter of persons and he stopped wrong-doing in however high quarters it might be discovered. On the day of his coronation the Sultan promulgated a decree to the effect, that no act of oppression or brutality should in future take place in his country, and that even on his own part, he would never molest or persecute any one. He further dictated that the amirs who were in the habit of causing annoyance and trouble to the people should stay their hands.

Thus it so happened that gradually by the grace of God and the order of the Sultan all mischief and devilry disappeared from the land and the people passed into smooth waters. The royal executioners and the cut-throats were sent about their business, and consequently, they became discontented and dissatisfied. " 'Tis a pity that we have a hard lot these days," they all deplored, "in olden times our conditions were much better and our hands were full, but now, we have enough of slack time and we rest upon our oars. In former times we made a fortune but now we are all out of pocket." When the complaints such as these came to the ears of the Sultan, he congratulated himself and thanked God for the fact that it was due to His grace that all tyrannical acts had disappeared from the land.

In accordance with the royal order, the plaintiffs and defendants were made to appear at the public court and accept the decision given by the Qazis in agreement with the *Sara*.

On the whole, shedding of human blood came to an end and no blood was spilt except by the physicians as a prophylactic measure.

Illegal gratification discontinued

In previous reigns the royal officers received illegal gratifications from the dealers of vegetables, fuels, fruits, bread, oil, gram, medicines and other commodities. The Kotwals and Muhtasibs received perquisites from the gamblers and other chartered libertines and thus increased the state coffer.

Sultan Firuz Shah now stopped such receipts. He ordered that taxes should be levied in agreement with the injunctions of the *Sara*, such as, Khiraz, Jeziya, Osur (1/10 of agricultural produce), Zakat, Tarkah, Khums and Laqtat. Royal agents were appointed for levying these taxes. The income thus derived was spent in works of public utility. If any officer was found to be extortionate he was flogged and paraded through the public highways on asses.

Removal of heresy

According to Islamic jurisprudence those who took part in the holy wars against the non-moslems received a portion of Khums (1/10 of the agricultural produce). Of the Khums thus collected 2 portions were given to cavalry, 1 to infantry, and the rest i.e. 2 portions went to the state treasury. But, later on, this practice was abandoned. One portion of the Khums was distributed to the soldiery and 4 portions went to the treasury. Thus, the soldiery was deprived of their legal dues. Sultan Firuz put a stop to this practice and he began to take one portion of the Khums for state purposes and divided the rest among his soldiers and other religious acts enjoined in the *Sara*.

Secondly, it had become customary among the Muslims to carry away the female folk and to seize the possessions of the Hindu neighbours with whom they had a bone to pick with. The Sultan stopped such practices.

Again, a convention had grown up in later days to recite the names of only the reigning sovereign in the *Khutba* on Fridays and the day of 'Id. At the order of the Sultan, this procedure was given up and the *Khutba* began to be read in accordance with the Muslim law.

The Sultan next turned to extirpating the new practices that bore no reference to *Hadis* but had crept into use. The Shias, not only refused to recognize Abu Bakr, Omar and Usman as the legal successors of the Prophet but they prepared effigies of Abu Bakr and Omar made of powder of wheat and gram mixed with sugar and honey. Thus, Abu Bakar and Omar were put to ridicule by the children, servants and other family members of the Shia household. The Sultan became incensed at this practice. He exclaimed "There is no creed except the Sunnis in Hindusthan: There are Hindus from whom Zizya is realised and those who (Hindus) are hostile, I kill and imprison them. Creeds such as, Rafzia, Nasebia, Quadriya, Jabriya, Mushabaha, Maatazila and their sub-sects do not exist here. If

any person belonging to these sects happen to be found in my country he should be brought to the court along with all their literatures relating to their creed so that a religious discussion could be held and they be ultimately brought in the fold of Sunni sect."

At the royal order, religious polemics were held with the Shias. Being reduced to silence by the Sunnis they gave up their sophistical and illogical tenets and embraced the Sunni doctrines. The Shia literatures were publicly burnt to cinder and the leaders of the Shias were sent to exiles. Thus was the country spared of a bloody internecine struggle between the two Muslim sects on account of the Sultan's intervention in the religious affairs.

It is reported, that there lived in the capital a heretical sect, who were in the habit of converting the people to their own creed. For the performance of their mysterious rites, they sometimes flocked together at some particular spot which had been previously cleansed and purified with cow-dung and strewn with rice and flowers. The converts had not to discard their creed, they had simply to acknowledge and affirm their new instructors and to fall on their knees before them. These heretics assembled in the cover of darkness with all the female folk of their household and took to drinking.

At the orders of the Sultan the heretics were run in, some of their leaders were lynched, some exiled and some pinned down according to the injunctions of the *Sara*.

Illegal seizure of land banned

In previous reigns it had become customary with the people to increase one's own share of landed property by illegal means. At the orders of the Sultan an enquiry was made into the rights of the proprietors and all documents concerning proprietorship were subjected to examination. By such measures those who had lost their lands got them back and their rights over them were acknowledged.

Promotion of Learning

One of the beneficial achievements of the Sultan was the promotion of learning in the country. Madrassas were opened at different places and the following subjects were taught in them:—*Fiqā* (Muh. Law), *Qirat* (grammar of the Quran), *Asul-i-Fiqā* (logic of Muh. Law), *Asul-i-Kalām* (science of religion), *Tafsīr* (Commentaries on the *Quran*), *Hādīs* (tradition), *Ma'qni* (rhetoric), *Bayān* (oratory), *Nabwa* (syntax), *Sarf* (etymology)

Ilm-i-nazar (science of light), *Ilm-i-Rayazı* (mathematics), *Tabii* (science in general), *Ilahi* (theology), *Ilm-i-tıbb* (medicine), *Tabrır* (calligraphy), *Khaat* (letter-writing). Stipends were given to the scholars. Thus the darkness of ignorance was dispelled by the light of education that spread in the country by the help of the Sultan.

Establishment of Khankahs

The Khankahs for the Mushaikhhs, (learned men) and other religious persons who had renounced the world, were established. Stipends and daily allowances were fixed for the poor. Travelling expenses were provided to the foreigners and the itinerants when they made their return to their countries. The imperial soldiers were equally supplied with all the necessities of life and even with furnitures and utensils, such as pokers, coal-rake for ovens, fans, hand-mills, pegs for hand-mills, mortar and pestle, ovens, a large sieve towels, big iron forks, frying pans, cups etc.

Sultan's visit to graveyard

One of the sterling features of the Sultan's character was that in company of his courtiers and nobles he visited his mother's tomb. For each cenotaph allowances were fixed. When he visited the necropolis he gave alms to the poor for the spiritual benefit of the departed soul.

Sultan's relations with nobles

On the demise of the stipendiaries and beneficiaries of the royal charity the assignments and donations were bequeathed to their legal heirs and successors. Even the domestics of the deceased's household were summoned at the court and given a sermon. Those who turned restive were properly dealt with, and corrective measures were imposed in such cases. For instance, on the death of Khān Jahān Maqbul, his successors, relatives, domestics and friends were made to appear at the court. They were reminded of the past services of the deceased and his influence at the court, and were asked to be obedient to the ruling authority. The rank and dignity, the possessions and properties of the late amir were not confiscated. The sons of the departed noble were given the title of Khān-i-Jahān. Likewise, similar treatment was offered to the families of Tātār Khān Bahadur Sultani, Khudāwand Khān, Khudāwand Qawamuddin Tirmizi, Sarkhan Mahmud Bak, Rustam Bakshi Dhudkhan bin Betu, 'Aniul Malik

'Ainuddin Mahiru, Malik Ikhtiyāruddin and others. The Sultan showed compassion and adopted measures for educating the sons and successors of the defunct nobles. He loved them as his own sons.

Instances of Sultan's kind-heartedness

Those criminals, who had been either deprived of their land or mutilated and otherwise punished during the reign of the previous emperors, were restored to their former positions, or granted pensions and allowances. They were further made to state in writing that they had been amply compensated and that they had no grievance against the former Sultan who had punished them. These letters were placed by the Sultan in a chest and placed near the sarcophagus of the late emperor.

Restoration of old edifices

Firuz repaired and restored old edifices such as masjids, pulpits, khankahs, buildings and bridges. For instance, he restored Huz-i-Sultani, which had been constructed by Sultan Shamsuddin Altamash. It is related in the work called *Fawa-i-dus Salatin*, which once belonged to Sheikh ul Islām Nizāmuddin, that once when Altamash intended to construct a hauz, he saw in a dream the Prophet riding on a horse and locating the position of the proposed hauz. When Altamash woke up, he visited the site that he had seen in his dream, and to his surprise found sweet and delicious water oozing out of the hoof-marks of the Prophet's horse. It was here that the hauz was constructed.

According to another story, Altamash had almost completed the hauz when he had to lead an expedition to Lakhnauti, and the work was thus suspended for a time. During his absence, his agent undertook the construction of the remaining portion of the hauz and the expenses were defrayed by the *Baitulmal* or the public treasury. Altamash on his return, caused that portion to be destroyed, for the money expended on it had been, in contravention to Muslim jurisprudence, taken from the public treasury. He caused a fresh erection of that portion of the hauz by his personal money.

Reclamation of public buildings

Altamash had a great fascination for constructing buildings and laying out gardens, and the nobles vied with one another in emulating their lord. Thus, the amirs of his court erected masjids, madrassas, khankahs, and muso-

leums. Later, the public had made such buildings their own and made profit out of them. Firuz Tughluq confiscated such buildings, and repaired them in such a manner, that they could last for a number of years more. For instance, the hauz named Khudawand Khvāja constructed by Altamash, had been totally spoiled in later years. There was a small quantity of water left in it, and it was used for washing purposes by the public. Firuz restored this old hauz and made it quite new.

The second was the hauz named Shahzādāh Mua'zzam Mubarak Khān, at Delhi having a well at the centre which, it is supposed, was constructed by a certain Brahmin. At the orders of the Sultan, a masonry wall was constructed on the sides of the well and a water wheel for drawing out water was fixed up on the top.

The minarets of the masjid of Delhi constructed by Muizuddin Muhammad Sam in 770 H. was repaired at the orders of Firuz. It was during the reign of Firuz that a severe lightning had caused damage to the minarets of the masjid and other buildings that lay between Firuzābād and Shāhpur. The repair work was continued for 6 months and the new construction surpassed the old one.

•
New construction

The Sultan built a palace named Firuzābād, on the bank of the Jumna, raised a mansion near the tank of Mubārak Khan and erected Koshak Firuz for purposes of hunting at the foot of the hills. Mosques, such as, Jama Jahan Panah, Jama Firuzābād and the golden Minaret were also built by him.

During his hunting excursions in the hills of Sirmur, the Sultan came across a stone pillar with inscriptions which could not be deciphered. It was erected at Mouza Maqbulābād Tobra on the banks of the Jumna. Historians relate, that the stone pillar had been set up some four thousand years before and a temple was erected near it. Story goes, that Kutluğ and Sharm Shirin, the Mongol leaders, having reached near the pillar ordered for putting faggots round it and setting fire to the combustibles. But no damage was done to the monument. Only some black marks were left on the pillar as a result of the conflagration.

For irrigation purposes, the Sultan erected aqueducts and canals, laid out gardens with trees of every variety and species and vegetable produce, and made the barren lands fertile and productive.

At the imperial orders, the Hindus were made to embrace Islam of their own accord as a result of good treatment on the part of Muslims, and they were exempted from the Zizya. Thus, many people embraced Islam as a result of Sultan's good treatment.

Firuz Tughluq tried to carry away the stone pillar and set it up near the Jumma mosque at Firuzābād. The royal attendants became surprised to see it and they wondered as to how such a huge pillar could be fixed up. They thought such an action could not be performed by man. In some native records it has been mentioned that the pillar was fixed to the bottom of the earth. Some relate that by some mysterious method it was so wedged in that none could remove it, and if any attempt was made to get it transferred, snakes, scorpions, big ants would issue out and cause danger to people.

The royal engineers could not make out as to how the pillar could be removed. They tried their best and failed. At last, the Sultan devised a plan for the purpose. Huge ropes, numerous elephants and cranes were requisitioned: about twenty thousand people were engaged, and after a good deal of labour, the pillar was carried to the river, placed on huge boats with the cranes and was carried to Firuzābād. A new building was constructed near the Jumma Masjid and with the help of lever and cranes the pillar was at last perked up. The above event took place in 769 H. (1367-68 A.D.).

The Sultan's intimacy with Faqirs

The Sultan often paid visit to saints and darwesh and offered them monetary help. Among the pious souls whom the Sultan frequently visited were, Sheikh ul Islām 'Alāuddīn, Sheikh ul Islām Nizāmuddin Aulia, Sharful Huq Wauddin Panipati. Panipati, it is said, led a very solitary life and seldom took any food. The portion of food which remained after he had taken it was never offered to any one. Sometimes, he took milk with sugar and sent a portion of the milk to the Sultan saying that Firuz was his son. Sheikh Jalāl ul Huq Wauddin, Sheikh Qutubuddin Mannwar Hānsi and his able son, were the well wishers of the crown. Many wellknown saints and hermits met the Sultan and offered him benedictions. The Sultan visited the faqirs on his way to Lakhnauti for hunting and offered them gifts. There was a certain faqir at Fatehābād named Sheikh Hambar, who lived on roots and leaves of trees and avoided human

society. The Sultan often paid him visit and constructed for his use a cell in the Jumma Mosque at Fatehābād. The darwesh was sometimes found walking outside the gate walls even when the fort-gates had been closed.

There was a certain darwesh named Bāhādur who always wore leather dress. Once, he enquired of the Sultan as to why he personally went round and took such an interest in his peoples' welfare. Whereupon the Sultan replied that if he enjoyed rest and pleasure, his subjects, whom God had entrusted to his care, would come to grief at the hands of their enemies and it was for this reason that the Sultan was alert and diligent so that his subjects enjoyed peace and tranquility.

K. K. BASU

Bhoganātha—a Poet of the 14th century

In my article on *Alaṅkārasudhānidhi* of Sāyaṇācārya¹, I mentioned that Sāyaṇa has referred to a number of important works and writers in his book on rhetoric. *Udāraṇamālā*, *Śṛṅgāramañjarī*, *Mahāgaṇapatistotra*, *Gaurināthāṣṭakam* and *Tripuravijaya* are some of the works cited by him and Bhoganātha is one of the poets referred to. *Alaṅkārasudhānidhi* gives certain details about Bhoganātha which are of considerable interest.

Bhoganātha was the younger brother of the famous Mādhava and Sāyaṇācārya.² In the colophon of the *Alaṅkārasudhānidhi* Sāyaṇa calls himself as the elder brother of Bhoganātha, भोगनाथाग्रजन्मनः। This shows that Bhoganātha had already become a figure of established fame by the time Sāyaṇa wrote his *Alaṅkārasudhānidhi*.

This Bhoganātha is the composer of the famous Bittarāgunte copper plate inscription³ which records a grant of a village called Bittaragunte situated seven miles southwest of Kavali, in the Nellur District, to one Śrīkantha, a Saiva philosopher who is considered to be the spiritual teacher of Saṅgama II. A mutilated inscription of the Arulāla-Perumāl temple at Conjeevaram⁴ says that he was the *guru* of Mādhavācārya and Sāyaṇa as well. The same

1 *Indian Culture*, vol. VI, No. 4.

2 श्रीमती यस्य जननी बुद्धिर्तिमय्याः पिता ।

सायणो भोगनाथश्च मनोबुद्धी सहोदरौ ॥ (*Parāśara-Mādhaviya*)

3 *Epigraphia Indica*, III, 23.

4 *Epigraphia Indica*, III, 118.

Śrīkaṇṭha or Śrīkaṇṭhanātha⁵ seems to have evoked the admiration of Bhoganātha as could be seen in the poem :

मंदारश्च तरुः परेऽपि तरवो मेरुश्च शैलः परे-
 ऽप्या शैलाः कमलाग्रहस्थशयनं चाब्धिः परेऽप्यब्धयः ।
 श्रीकण्ठश्च गुरुः परेऽपि गुरवो लोकत्रयेऽप्यद्भुतं
 भक्ताधीनमवांश्च दैवतमहो सर्वेऽप्यमी देवताः ॥

It is quite probable that Bhoganātha was one of the disciples of Śrīkaṇṭha and looked upon the latter as his guru. This Bittaragunte inscription is written in various metres, in Sanskrit. Therein, Bhoganātha styles himself as a scholar and a born companion of Saṅgama II. इति भोगनाथ-
 सुधिया संगमभूपालनर्ममचिवेन ।

The verse :

अन्योन्यप्रणयापराधनिवृत्तव्यापारदीनात्मनो-
 देवीसंगमयोः पराङ्मुखतयाऽप्येकासने तस्थुषोः ।
 मध्ये सायणमंत्रिणा न भणितं श्रीभोगनाथेन वा
 नोक्तं नमैसखीजनेन च तदप्यन्योन्यमुद्धोक्षितम् ॥

found in the *Alaṅkārasudhānidhi* of Sāyaṇa speaks of the great intimacy that existed between Bhoganātha and Saṅgama II. While Sāyaṇa was working as the minister of Saṅgama, Bhoganātha lived there as the court poet and companion of the king.

The following extracts are taken from the Bittaragunte inscription to show that he was a poet of a high order.

अस्ति प्रसूयमानप्रबलनिजभुजाखर्वैर्गर्वानुरोधि-
 स्वाधीनोदारसारस्थगितरिपुनृपोद्दामसंप्रामशक्तिः ।
 राजा राजन्यकोटिप्रणतिपरिलुठन्मौलिमाणिक्यरोचि
 राजीनीराज्यमानस्फुरदुरुचरणाभोरुहस्संगमेन्द्रः ॥
 यस्य दृष्टिमुदयद्वयारसार्थिनामभिमतानुबन्धिनीम् ।
 हंत नूनमनुयाति सस्पृहं कर्णकल्पतरुकामधेनवः ॥
 यद्भुजाश्रयणजातकौतुका नापरंजयरमाभिद्वसवती ।
 संयुगानि समुपेयुषे चिरादासिधारमनुतिष्ठति व्रतम् ॥
 यद्यशःप्रसरणेन भूयसा ह्लादमेयुषि परं जगत्त्रये ।
 अरनुते विफलतां न चंद्रमाः केवलं कुमुदिनीविकासनात् ॥

श्रीमान् प्राक् प्रत्यगन्धितयपरिवृढस्सैष भाषातिलिङ्घि
 क्षुद्रक्षमाश्रद्धजंगं प्रतिभटधरणीपालसेनाविभालः ।
 मायं नागाश्च मर्त्याधिपतिगजघटा पंचवक्त्रोभियाती-
 त्युद्धुष्यते यदीयाः स्फुटमिह विरुदास्संततं वंदिवृद्धैः ॥
 इत्थं सर्वगुणोपरंजनकलामीदृग्विधाभेयुष-
 स्तस्य क्षोणिपतेरपारयशसस्तत्त्वोपदेशक्रियाम् ।
 कर्तुं कामपि वासनामुपनयन्कारुण्यवारो निधिः
 श्रीमान् संनिधिमादधत् पशुपतिः श्रीकंठनामात्मना ॥
 माहेश्वराणां तत्त्वानां मान्ये यस्मिन् प्रदर्शके ।
 प्राचामदशि नाथानां प्रायेण नवता भुवि ॥
 सदृत्तोदारमुक्तामयभरितवपुर्निर्त्यसौगुण्यगण-
 क्षेत्वालंकारभूतश्शमितकटुमनस्तापवह्निप्रकाशः ।
 आद्यो वर्णः प्रसिद्धिं श्रयति खलु यतश्शाखतावासरम्यः
 स श्रीकंठाग्रहारः स्फुरतु विगलितलासमाचंद्रतारम् ॥

Sāyaṇācārya in his *Alaṅkārasudbānidhi* refers to Bhoganātha as a महाकवि and quotes from some of his works.

क्षीरात्मा...ख्यात्युपेतान् ।

अत्र रौद्रबीभत्सवीररसप्रसंगाभावेपि तदुचितरचनास्वीकारयोग्याधिक्यादिप्रबंधव्यतिरेकेण
 स्थायीभूतभक्तिरूपरतिभावे महागणपतिस्तनवे श्रीमतेर्मेहागणपतेर्वाहनत्वेन समुपजायमानगर्वगरिभ्यः
 प्रभुभवनाधिकारप्रपौढव्यस्य मूषिकस्त्योक्तौ परुषाक्षरप्राणवति संघटना श्रीभोगनाथेन महाकविना ।

In another place he says, तेषामुदाहरणानि भोगनाथकाव्येषु द्रष्टव्यानि ।

“Illustrations of the rules have to be sought for in the works of Bhoganātha.” This statement well indicates the high regard in which Sāyaṇa, one of the greatest scholars and poets of the day, held the works of Bhoganātha.

There are a few verses in the *Alaṅkārasudānidhi* which speak of the martial spirit of Sāyaṇa such as,

अमुं शमितशास्त्रवस्थिरभुजावलेपोदयं
 समीक्ष्य युधि सायणं समधिको भवेद्विस्मयः ।
 नखाग्रहतवैरिणोर्नरहरेर्हरस्याथवा
 नवांबुजदलोत्सन्नयनमालदग्धद्विषः ॥
 आकर्ण्य यात्रापटहप्रणादानपोढनिद्रैस्तव सायणार्थ्य ।
 अरण्यसिंहैरिभूपतीनामाहन्यते चित्तगतोपि हस्तौ ॥

These are taken from the *Udāharaṇamālā* of Bhoganātha which appears to contain similar stanzas and it is likely that the work was written by the poet in praise of his elder brother Sāyaṇa.

Sāyaṇācārya quotes the following poem as an illustration of प्रौढि

संभाव्यन्तेभरितभुवनस्सागरोपांतवासा
विशुद्धक्षीवलयितवपुर्विभ्रमाः कालमेघाः ।
अन्योन्यांगव्यतिकरमुषामंतरा गोपिकानां
रासक्रीडारसिकमनसा रागिणा दैवतेन ॥

and says that it is cited from *Śṛṅgāramañjarī*. इति व्याख्यातं शृंगारमंजरीम् ।

This and the other verse beginning with अन्योन्य प्रणयापराध निश्चत व्यापार दीनात्मनोः । quoted above, are from his work called *Śṛṅgāramañjarī*.

The poem मंदारश्च तहः wherein a high praise is given to Śrīkaṇṭha the *guru* of Saṅgama is taken from the poem Mahāgaṇapati-stava, which is in praise of Gaṇapati. A similar devotional work praising the God Śiva titled as *Gaurīnāthāṣṭakam* seems to have been written by him. An example of a prayer to the Lord is cited here, from the work.

कष्टाय प्रसवाय शास्त्रपदवीशिष्टाय कान्तानल-
प्लुष्टाय प्रथमानमत्सुरगणाविष्टाय दुष्टात्मने ।
रुष्टाय प्रतिषिद्धकार्यघटनातुष्टाय स्रष्टागसे
गौरीनाथ गणाधिनाथ जनक प्रीणानु मर्ष भवाम् ॥

There is another work which is referred to in the *Alaṅkārasudhānidhi*, called *Tripuravijayam*. The title itself suggests that it is a kāvya dealing with the story of Īśvara's conquest of Tripura. The following verse gives us a fine description of the burning city.

उपर्यधो रचितमयश्च राजितं तयोर्द्वयोः कनकमयं च मध्यतः ।
पुरतल्यं दहनविधेः पुरोप्यगात्सधूमतां सदहनतां स भस्मताम् ॥

Two or three stray verses are mentioned in the *Alaṅkārasudhānidhi* and it is said that they are taken from the work, *Rāmollāsa* of Bhoganātha. The book deals with the Rāma story. The way in which Rāma led Sītā in the frightful forest during the winter seasons of his exile is thus described in the stanza

शिशिरेषु शिलातलेषु रामस्तरुमूलेषु तलोदरीं दरीषु ।
सरसीषु च विश्रम्य मुग्धां पथि पाषाणि नितानैरनैषीत् ॥

quoted by Sāyaṇa.

The simple and charming style employed in the verse does credit to any great poet.

Thus we learn, from the material available at present, that Bhoganātha was a great poet and that he was the author of at least six works.

(1) *Mahāgaṇapatistōtra*. (2) *Gaurīnāthāṣṭaka*. (3) *Udāharaṇamāla*. (4) *Śṛṅgāramañjarī*. (5) *Tripuravijayam*. (6) *Rāmollāsa*.

The first two are stotras in praise of Gṇapati and Śiva and they incidentally speak of the position of the poet and his relationship with his contemporaries, especially Saṅgama and Śrikanṭha. *Udāharaṇamālā* and *Śṛṅgāraṇaṇī* appear to be works on rhetoric. The former seems to have been devoted to the praise of Sāyaṇa and the latter to Kṛṣṇa as the hero of the work. The other two works are Kāvya, one based on the story of Śiva and the other of *Rāmāyaṇa*. These, when discovered, will throw light upon the famous Vidyāraṇya brothers and the contemporary Vijayanagara history. In addition to it, they will be important additions to the Sanskrit literature.

The following further references to Bhoganātha are made in the *Alaṅkārasudhānidhi*:

यथा पुरा कौशिकमित्ययोर्मिथो नभस्थले कौशिककाकसंकुले ।
तथा नियुद्धं भुवि भोगनाथ भो भवत्कटाक्षास्मदकिंचनत्वयोः ॥
भूयतस्संगमैर्द्रस्य भोगनाथस्य वा कवेः ।
वारणां वारणो नाथ द्वारि प्रविशतां हि ये ॥
स एव खलु माधवो वसुमतिं चतुस्सागरं
समाकलितमेखलान्नयति बुक्कराजो यथा ।
कमन्वजनि माधवस्तमनु भोगनाथश्च ता-
बुभावुदयमाश्रितावचलमिन्नविरवेश्वरौ ॥

As an illustration for व्यंग्य, the suggested sense:—

व्यंग्यः यथा :—

श्रीभोगनाथ महनीय महानुभाव श्रीमंगलसिंकर शंखरथांगचिह्नम् ।
ये माधवं मधु विरोधिनमाश्रयन्ते तेषां करोदरगतैव हि सर्वसिद्धिः ॥

From these references it is evident that Bhoganātha the younger brother of Mādhava, and Sāyaṇa was intimately connected with Saṅgama II who ruled at Nellore, first as the Viceroy and then as an independent king of the Vijayanagara empire. He was a scholar and a poet of established fame. His works are cited and referred to by Sāyaṇa and he was looked upon as a man of great talents. He, however, did not choose to write books on a special branch of learning like his elder brothers who have become famous for their commentaries on the Vedas, law books and grammar, but preferred to lead a quiet life at the court of Saṅgama writing now and then a few Kāvya and stotras. The works attributed to him exhibit the richness of imagination and scholarship.

REVIEWS

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF MYSORE, 1938. 249 pp. with 36 Plates and Index, Bangalore, 1940; IBID., 1939. 217 pp. with 29 Plates and Index, Mysore, 1940.

These two volumes worthily maintain the high standard of scholarship set up in previous Reports of the Archaeological Survey of Mysore issued by the present Director, Dr. M. H. Krishna. We find here the usual full descriptions of monuments accompanied with copious and excellent Plates, illuminating notes on coins, analyses of interesting manuscripts, and last but not the least, scholarly editions of inscriptions frequently with transcripts, transliterations in modern Kanarese (and sometimes Roman and Devanāgarī as well), English translations and notes along with very useful indices arranged according to dynasties and dates and furnished with summaries of contents. The print, paper and get-up are all of excellent quality and worthy of one of the most enlightened of our Indian States.

In the *Report* for 1938, Pt. II ('Study of Ancient Monuments') deals in the first instance with a number of hill-forts briefly noticed in previous Annual Reports, but now set forth with detailed lists of antiquities and adequate sketch-maps as well as illustrations. Of the temples described in this section while some have the typical characteristics of the Hoysala style of architecture, one (p. 25 and Pl. X, 2) has the roundish form of *Garbhagrha* characteristic of modern Travancore shrines (unfortunately the author does not discuss the point whether there is any causal relation between the two), while another group (p. 36 and Pl. XV, pp. 39-40 and Pl. XVIII), attributed by the author on the authority of the late Mr. R. Narasimhachar to Rāja Rāja Coḷa, shares in the distinctive features of that great king's building style. It is however difficult to account for the inclusion in this section of objects of natural interest, such as these described on pp. 24-25, and 41 with accompanying Plates. The numerous temple sculptures noticed in connection with the present section do not seem to have much artistic merit but are undoubtedly of high iconographic value. In particular we notice several specimens of Gaṅgā and Yamunā figures on their *vāhanas* (p. 22) which mark a much interesting extension of a north Indian *motif* dating from Gupta times into the far south. Of striking interest is an ancient image of Mahiṣāsūramardīnī (p. 16, and Pl. V) which the author ascribes on stylistic grounds to the Gaṅga period, say, *circa* 800 A.D.

An important portion of this section (pp. 46-71) describes the remarkable series of wall-paintings at the Jaganmohan Palace of Mysore City, built by His Highness Kṛṣṇarāja Wāḍeyār III in 1861 A.D. The paintings include portraits of the present ruling house of Mysore as well as of sundry Indian and foreign rulers and statesmen, such as Ranjit Singh, Hydar Ali and Tipu Sultan, Nizam Ali and Salar Jang of Hyderabad, Dost Mahammad Khan of Kabul, the Dewan Purniah and so forth. There is besides an interesting account of the painting of the Jambūsavāri procession of the Maharaja on the Vijayā Daśamī day of the Navarātri festival.

In the section on Numismatics (Pt. III) the author gives with adequate illustrations an interesting account of a collection of eleven silver punch-marked coins. It would have been well if the author had classified the coins according to the types distinguished by John Allan in his well-known *Catalogue* recently published.

The section on Inscriptions (Pt. V) contains a detailed study of one hundred and twenty records with dates ranging from *circa* 567 to 1849 A.D. The earliest and most important is a copper-plate grant of the Gaṅga king Avinīta dated in his twelfth regnal year. This according to the author (pp. 88ff.) confirms the evidence of the *Avantisundarikathā* regarding the contemporaneity of Avinīta's son Durvinīta with the Pallava king Sīṃhaviṣṇu. The author takes this opportunity to discuss the chronology and genealogy of the Gaṅgas, his conclusions confirming those of Jouveau Dubreuil (*Early History of the Deccan*, p. 105).

Part II of the *Annual Report* for 1939 contains the author's conservation notes on a large number of monuments inspected during the official year. Part III gives detailed accounts of a large number of ancient monuments and sites ranging from Gaṅga to Vijayanagara periods. Besides a number of structures in the usual Hoysala style we have here a few other temples belonging to what the author calls Hoysala-Dravidian type (Cf. pp. 27-28 with accompanying plates). A peculiar Hoysala shrine described on p. 37 (Pl. V) has 3 cells placed parallel to each other and having a common navaraṅga. A group of Jain *bastis* which is noticed on pp. 44-46 (Pl. IX) bears according to the author, a distant resemblance to the Kailāsa temple of Ellora and the Dharmarāja Rath at Mahabalipuram and should be assigned to *circa* 900 A.D.

The section on Numismatics (Pt. IV) describes five (or four, one being marked as doubtful) types of Western Gaṅga gold and copper coins.

These are marked on the obverse by the characteristic device of an usually caparisoned elephant. Describing one of these types, the gold Varāha, the author says (pp. 97-98) that though generally known as the Gajapati type and attributed to the Eastern Gaṅgas of Kalinga, they were probably issued by the long-lived Gaṅga dynasty of Mysore and imitated in later times by the Kalinga Gaṅgas who gave it its current name of Gajapati. It would be interesting to have more convincing evidence of this remarkable suggestion as also of the association of the above-mentioned coins generally with the Western Gaṅgas. As regards the author's contention (p. 98) of the expansion of Karnāṭaka influence in this connection, the striking Karnāṭaka type of coins issued by king Harṣa of Kashmir corroborating a verse of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* had already been noticed by Cunningham (*Coins of Mediaeval India*, p. 34) and Rapson (*Indian Coins*, p. 32), while the tradition regarding the foundation of a Karnāṭaka dynasty in Nepal by Nānyadeva which the author bases on the dubious authority of Lewis Rice, has been already accepted as a historical fact by Sylvain Lévi (*Le Nepal*, vol. II, p. 201). We would like in this connection to correct two slips of the learned author: the true dates of Harṣa of Kashmir are 1089-1101 and not circa 1000 A.D. and the correct reference in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* is Canto VII, verse 926 and not verse 100.

Under the head Inscriptions (Pt. VI) the author notices nearly seventy inscriptions ranging in date from the Western Cālukya Vikramāditya II to His Highness Kṛṣṇarāja Wāḍeyār. Though dealing with matters of varied interest, none of them appears to be of outstanding importance.

Although the present publications mark a notable contribution to our knowledge of the history and archaeology of the Mysore State.

U. N. GHOSHAL

SAWĀNIHĀT-I-MUMTĀZ of Muhammad Karīm, translated into English by Dr. S. Muḥammad Husayn Nainar, M.A., LL.B., Ph.D., Head of the Department of Arabic, Persian and Urdu, University of Madras. Being vol. III of *Sources of the History of the Nawwābs of the Carnatic*, published by the University of Madras, 1940. xiii + 208 pages.

This volume contains the major portion of the English translation of *Sawāniḥāt-i-Mumtāz*, a Persian chronicle which gives a detailed history of the reign of Wālājah II (Nawāb of the Carnatic, 1795-1801 A.D.), with a

brief account of the last years of the reign of his father, Muhammad Ali (Wālājāh I), together with a summary of the events in the reigns of Wālājāh III, Wālājāh IV and Wālājāh V. The author of this chronicle is Muhammad Karīm, a grandson (daughter's son) of Muhammad Ali. He was born in 1780 A.D. The work was written during the years 1834-1837 A.D. It is disappointing to find that a contemporary observer, whose relationship with the ruling family gave him good opportunities for collecting authentic details, has given us a volume which is practically useless from the historian's point of view. The present volume of English translation carries the history of the Carnatic from the last years of Muhammad Ali's reign to the death of Wālājāh II. The most important topic for the historian of the Carnatic during this period is the encroachment of the province by the East India Company, culminating in Lord Wellesley's famous declaration dated July 27, 1801. Muhammad Karīm devotes only a few paragraphs to this subject, while he describes in great detail "a number of marriage celebrations which show how matches were made, the character of the celebrations essential to different members of the royal family, and the amounts spent on such festivities." It is one more instance to show that Persian chronicles offer very little material to the historian of modern India. Dr. Nainar is a competent and conscientious translator, but his *Introduction* offers little assistance to readers who are in touch with the Carnatic history. He could have given us valuable supplementary information if he had consulted the documents preserved in Madras and New Delhi. The volume contains a useful glossary, but unfortunately there is no Index.

A. C. BANERJEE.

EARLY CAREER OF KANHOJI ANGRIA AND OTHER PAPERS, by Dr. Surendra Nath Sen, M.A., Ph.D., B.Litt., Keeper of the Records of the Government of India. Published by the University of Calcutta. 1941. 225 pages.

This volume contains 19 valuable papers 'based on unpublished sources not easily accessible to the average reader.' These papers were written at different times during the last ten years and published in various journals. Of these, 8 papers deal with various topics connected with the history of the Marathas, on which the author is a recognised authority. He gives us many interesting details about the Maratha Navy collected from

Portuguese and Dutch sources. In his 'Note on the Annexation of Jawli' he gives a new interpretation of that rather notorious event in Shivaji's career. In the *Portuguese Account of Haidar Ali* he furnishes us with interesting details about the early career of the famous Mysore chief. Five papers are devoted to the history of Bengal, medieval and modern. In one of them, written in 1930, the author suggested that the records lying scattered in the District Record Rooms of Bengal should be concentrated at one convenient centre and made available to research scholars. It is gratifying to note that the Government of Bengal have at last decided to transfer the records to the custody of the Calcutta University. The volume concludes with two ably written papers on some problems of medieval and modern Indian history. On the whole, Dr. Sen has given us a volume which combines the minute care characteristic of the research scholar with that breadth of vision which distinguishes a historian from a chronicler.

A. C. BANERJEE

JENGHIZ KHAN by C. C. Walker, Squadron Leader in the Royal Canadian Air Force. London, Luzac & Co. 1939. 215 pages.

Jenghiz Khan is one of the most remarkable figures in the history of medieval Asia, but it is regrettable that full and authentic details about him are not available. As our author says, "the man himself remains a nebulous figure in the shadows." Any one who tries to lift the veil naturally deserves our gratitude. We have read Mr. Walker's book with great interest. Being a military man himself, he gives a clear and convincing account of Jenghiz Khan's campaigns. There are seven excellent maps which illustrate various aspects of the great Khan's political and military career. Our only regret is that Mr. Walker has not given us a bibliography, although it is clear that he has utilised ancient Chinese sources as well as modern historical works.

A. C. BANERJEE

'BUSSY IN THE DECCAN' being extracts from 'BUSSY AND FRENCH INDIA' by A. Martineau. Translated by Dr. Miss A. Cammiade, L.M.S. With a foreword by Nawab Ali Yaver Jung Br., Ex-Professor of Modern History, Osmania University, published by The Society for the History of French India, Pondicherry. 1941.

Professor A. Martineau is well-known to the French scholars of history for his historical works. The book under review, 'Bussy in the Deccan'

being extracts from 'Bussy and French India,' (published in Paris 1935) is now made available to the English reading public, thanks to the efforts of Dr. Miss Cammiade. The object of this translation is to place at the disposal of the Anglo-Indian community a complete documentary narrative of all the facts of Bussy's mission.

Though an extract in itself, it forms a detailed study of the part played by Bussy in the Deccan affairs. The subject is undoubtedly an important one and deserves a special study, particularly the period illustrates the French activities and displays the genius of Bussy and Duplex.

Martineau, who combines the dual personality of administrator as well as author, has bestowed a great deal of care and labour on the book and has brought to light much valuable material. He has made an important contribution to the study of this otherwise obscure period, and every student of Deccan history should be grateful to him.

This narrative of 12 chapters is interspersed with sidelight glances at the condition of state affairs of Arcot, Hyderabad, Poona, Delhi, not to mention others. Martineau appears to rely mainly on French sources and, therefore, contemporary sources of Marathi, Persian and other records, have not been referred to which leaves something to be desired.

The English version is not the whole of the original French but a translation only of extracts, as a result of which the narrative appears at times to be disjointed. Where language falters, as at places it does, one may excuse the translator as English is not her tongue. The transliteration of oriental names is not orthodox and owes its origin to Martineau's own book which follows the French system and is therefore a little strange to us.

We have a little fault to find with the printing which appears to have been done in haste and requires correction in several places which we hope will be rectified when the second edition appears.

KASIM ALI SAJAN LAL

THE VAṆ-MANḌANA-GUNA-DŪTA-KĀVYA by Vīreśvara, edited for the first time with an Introduction in English and Appendices by Prof. Jatinra Bimal Chaudhuri, Ph.D. *Samskṛta-Dūta-kāvya-saṃgraha*. Publication No. 2. Calcutta.

The *Van-mañdana-guna-dūta-kāvya* of Vīreśvara is a unique Messenger-poem, the editor points out, as it does not follow the usual theme of the

Dūta-kāvya, viz. sending a love-message, nor does it take up a religious-philosophical subject. It solicits the patronage of a king. The detailed contents give an idea of the subject-matters and the intrinsic merit of the work. In the Introduction the editor deals with all the relevant topics regarding the author and the work, and fully demonstrates the excellence of the Vānmaṇḍana-guṇa-dūta from various points of view, geographical, rhetorical and metrical and so on. The emendations suggested reflect much credit on the part of the editor. As an editor Dr. Chaudhuri deserves compliments and we hope that he will produce many more works of equal merit and continue serving the cause of Sanskrit studies.

AMARESWAR THAKUR

THE CANDRA-DŪTA-KĀVYA of Jambū Kavi, edited for the first time with an Introduction in English and Appendices by Prof. Jatindra Bimal Chaudhuri, Ph.D. *Saṃskṛta-Dūta-Kāvya-saṃgraha*, Publication No. 3. Calcutta.

This dūta-kāvya consists of only 23 verses, of which 8 verses missing in the original Ms., could not be restored. The informations about the Mss. of the Candra-dūta are indeed instructive. Dr. Chaudhuri has ably proved that the *Candra-dūta* is an earlier work than Dhoyī's *Pavana-dūta*. He convincingly proves that Jambū Kavi, author of the *Candra-dūta*, must have flourished towards the end of the 9th century A.D. and continued his literary activities at least upto the middle of the 10th century A.D.—thus being earlier than the Dhoyī, author of the *Pavana-dūta* by a couple of centuries. The *Pavana-dūta* is, therefore, no longer to be regarded as the earliest extant Dūta-kāvya in imitation of the *Megha-dūta*. All other relevant topics regarding the literary activities of Jambū, the merit and demerit of the work, etc. have also been dealt with in the Introduction. Short accounts of several other Candra-dūtas with extracts from unpublished Mss. have also been given. Dr. Chaudhuri proves satisfactorily with an array of evidence that Vinaya-vijaya Gaṇin, author of the *Indu-dūta*, must have flourished in the 17th century. The geographical, historical and literary importance of all the Candra and Indu Dūtas hitherto known has been amply brought out in the Introduction. The readings of Ms. are admittedly corrupt; the emendations suggested are, however, happy. The Appendices are helpful.

AMARESWAR THAKUR

HAIDAR ALI, by Dr. Narendra Krishna Sinha, M.A., Ph.D., Lecturer in History, Calcutta University. Vol. I, 1721-1779. Calcutta. 1941.

The volume under review is a very scholarly and thoughtful contribution to modern Indian history. Dr. Sinha has already established his reputation for cautious and accurate scholarship by his valuable works on Sikh history. From the North-West he has now directed his attention to the South: the author of *Ranjit Singh* now gives us the first critical account of Haidar Ali. Dr. Sinha has utilised materials collected from many places—Mysore, Madras, Travancore, Nova Goa, Calcutta, New Delhi, London—and written in more languages than a student of History can master: English, Marathi, Persian, Kanarese, Tamil, Telegu, Portuguese, Dutch and French. He is to be specially congratulated upon his successful handling of a vast mass of Marathi material, which has given him a new perspective—for Haidar's contact with the Marathas was very intimate throughout his career—and enabled him to throw new light upon little known aspects of Maratha policy after Panipat. Hardly less interesting is Dr. Sinha's unqualified condemnation of the bungling diplomacy of the Madras Government, based on a thorough analysis of unpublished official documents. In the second volume of his book Dr. Sinha proposes to deal with the Second Anglo-Mysore War, Haidar's administration and military system and the extent of French influence in his court. It is hoped that he will illustrate his account of the Second Anglo-Mysore War with as clear, accurate and excellently finished maps as he has provided for us in the present volume.

I. BANERJEE

"THE ARCHÆOLOGY OF GUJARAT (including Kathiawar)" by H. D. Sankalia, M.A., LL.B., Ph.D. 1941. Natwarlal & Co., Publishers, Bombay.

Dr. Sankalia has recently published a book on the Archæology of Gujarāt which by its very nature is for the most part a compilation of matter culled from various sources. It is divided into twelve chapters which are embellished with forty-one plates containing seventy-eight illustrations. There are as many as thirteen appendices. The main text is devoted to Geography, History, Architecture, Epigraphy, Numismatics etc. As the author has himself admitted, the chapters on Administration, Society and Religion are not strictly pertinent to the main body of the thesis. This

work which is now placed before us was written as a thesis for the Ph.D. degree in Archæology of the London University which has subsidised its publication with a grant from its Publication Fund. Dr. Sankalia's efforts are indeed laudable but many of his statements are not accurate. The proof-reading is particularly careless, in the Appendices, where the place-names are not correctly reproduced.

A few mistakes of omission or commission are pointed here. *The Bhavnagar Sanskrit and Prakrit Inscriptions* read the date of the Mūlawāsar (Dwārkā) Stone Inscription of Rudrasena (Kṣatrapa) as (Śaka) 232 but Rapson in his *Coins of the Western Kshatrapas* and Lüders in his *List* (No. 962), *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. X and other scholars have corrected the date as (Śaka) 122. It is not known why Dr. Sankalia sticks to the long discarded view. If he has any cogent reasons, he should have pointed out the latter modifications of eminent scholars and adduced his reasons for accepting the older view. He has omitted some important inscriptions and remarked that the inscriptions of Kharagraha I of Valabhī (Appendix p. 9), and of the Cālukya rulers Cāmuṇḍa (p. 37) and Mūlarāja II, (p. 40) of Patan are not known. The inscriptions of the above kings have already been published. Of Kharagraha I, the Virḍi copper plates appear in the *Proceedings of the VII All India Oriental Conference*, Baroda, 1933. His Amreli plates are also known from the reports of the Watson Museum at Rajkot. The *Brāhmaṇawādā* Plates of Mūlarāja II are published in 1939 in the *Buddhi-prakāśa*, a standard Gujarātī Quarterly. The copper plate grant of Cāmuṇḍa appeared in the *Bhāratiya-Vidyā*, vol. I. pt. 1. Muni Jinavijayaji the learned editor tells us that it was noticed by him in his address as the chairman of the History Section of the XII Gujarātī Literary Conference.

The author tells us on p. 28 that about eighty Valabhī grants are known but he lists in Appendix A as many as ninety-nine. In fact more than one hundred and five are known by now. Similar want of accuracy is observed in his treatment of Gujarat coins. On p. 46 he states that punch-marked coins are not found in Gujarat. But in a f.n. of the same page he says that 17 punch-marked coins from Kamrej are known and they have not been described. It is not known whether he is referring to the coins found by the Baroda Archæological Department. In that case he has failed to see that the coins have been described in the *Annual Report of the Department for 1935-36*, pp. 45 ff. These pieces were not described in my article on 'Important coins from Baroda' published in the *Journal of the Numismatic Society of India*,

vol. I. as the object of that article was to describe and illustrate only rare or unknown types. He describes Valabhī coins on p. 190. So far it has been known that on the obverse of these coins is the bust of the king and on the reverse is a *triśūla* with the legend round it. This has been the consensus of scholars beginning with Cunningham. The author however tells us that he has studied these coins in the British Museum, London, and has found a Bull on the reverse. It would be interesting if he publishes such a specimen. The author does not mention the normal coins with the *triśūla* on the obverse and there seems to be a sort of confusion in his statement.

The author in some places shows his ignorance of mythological and religious matters. Thus (on p. 242) he states that *Śivarātri* is the birth day of Śiva and (on p. 239) *Naivedya* includes *Akshata*, *Kumkum* flowers, Sandal-paste etc. These are obviously wrong and no Hindu needs to be told what they correctly connote.

The author in the introduction tells us that he visited many places to verify the descriptions of monuments. Tāraṅgā still possesses some Buddhist monuments which have been described in the *Journal of the Gujarat Research Society*, 1939, vol. I, pt. 3, pp. 61 ff. The absence of any reference to Buddhist monuments at this place in the book is clearly due to Dr. Sankalia's want of personal investigations. The very name of the locality is suggestive. This remark holds good for many more places. It appears that the author has not read the works of contemporary scholars. Otherwise it is difficult to explain his remarks on p. 190 suggesting that "a systematic exploration and even trial diggings at the site of the Sahasraliṅga *talao* may turn up a few coins besides other material." The work of excavating the Sahasraliṅga *talao* at Patan is being carried on for over five years by the Baroda Government.

A. S. GADRE

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Annals of Oriental Research, vol. V, pt. 2 (1940-41)

K. RAMAKRISHNAIYA.—*Dravidian Phonetics*.

C. KUNHAN RAJA.—*Sarvānukramaṇī-padya-vivṛti*. Extracts from this unknown metrical commentary on the *Rgvedasarvānukramaṇī* have been published here.

—.*Niruktavārtika*. The *Niruktavārtika* is named and quoted in Paramēśvara's *Gopālikā*, a commentary on the *Sphoṭasiddhi* of Maṇḍana-miśra. Durgācārya, a commentator of the *Nirukta* of Yāska also quotes from a work called *Vārtika*. Some passages found quoted by Mādhava also seem to have been taken from a work in the nature of a *Niruktavārtika*. The source of all these quotations must have been a gloss on the *Nirukta* not yet discovered.

—.*Studies on Kālidāsa*. A number of verses in Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṃśa* is singled out as interpolation on grounds of impropriety. The entire second half of the same epic beginning with the ninth canto is regarded as an addition by a later hand. The fact that the first eight cantos of the *Raghuvaṃśa* contain profuse allusions to Kumāra, the theme of another epic of the poet, while the rest of the work rarely refers to the said theme is the main reason for arriving at such a conclusion. In regard to the genealogy of the Raghu family there is much discrepancy in the first half of the *Raghuvaṃśa* with the account of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, while the second half of the poem completely agrees with the *Rāmāyaṇa* in this respect. This also supports the conjecture that the whole of the *Raghuvaṃśa* is not from the same pen.

V. RAGHAVAN.—*Notes on Some Ancient South Indian Political Geographical Names*. The following suggestions have been made in the Notes: (1) *Preharā* is the word that occurs in the Tālaguṇḍa inscription and neither *Premarā* nor *Prehāra* as read by some. It is the name of a river near Aparānta. (2) The *Aśmakavaṃśa* named in Bhāmaha's *Kāvya-lamkāra* was a poem in the Vaidarbha style dealing with a line of kings of the Aśmaka territory that lay contiguous to the Vaidarbhas. (3) The word *Pallava* signifies the country ruled by the Pallava sovereigns with their capital at Kāñcī. The expression *Trairājyapallava* occurring in several inscriptions means the Pallava kingdom comprising three units. (4) *Dramila* originally meant the Tamil-speaking

country as a whole, used later on in its restricted application to the Pallava territory alone. (5) *Sibi* was another name for the Cola country.

- S. S. SURYANARAYAN SASTRI AND E. P. RADHAKRISHNAN.— तत्त्वशुद्धिः . This Advaita manual from its thirty-third chapter to the end has been edited in this instalment. The author Jñānaghana flourishing in the beginning of the 10th century was a follower of the particular variety of the Advaita doctrine known as the *Vivaraṇaprasthāna*.

Jaina Vidyā, vol. I, no. 1 (July, 1941)

- A. M. GHATAGE.—*The Title Mūlasūtra*. The *Āvaśyaka*, *Daśavaikālika*, *Uttarādhyayana* and *Piṇḍaniryukti*, four texts belonging to the Ardha-Māgadhi Jain canon are known by the common name *Mūlasūtra*, because, it has been suggested in this note, they formed the preliminary course of religious study for the Jains.
- JAGAN NATH.—*Jainism in the Gupta Age*. A few inscriptions recording erection of Jain images in the different parts of Northern India during the reign of the Imperial Guptas in the 5th century A.C. shows that in those days, Jainism claimed adherents from influential sections of the society.
- MOHANLAL DALICHAND DESAI.—*Imperial Farmāns Granted by Emperor Akbar to Jains*. The paper contains English renderings of four farmāns issued at different dates by Akbar and his governors ordering the government officials to show respect to particular Jain monks and to disallow slaughter of animals during Jain festivals.
- P. K. GODE.—*The Date of the Nāṭyadarpaṇa of Rāmacandra, the Pupil of Hemacandra—Between A.D. 1150-1170*.

Journal of the Benares Hindu University, vol. V, no. 3 (1941)

- JAYCHANDRA VIDYALANKAR.—*The family of Caṣṭana*. The conclusions reached by scholars regarding the reigns of the Saka satraps in India have been discussed, and evidence has been adduced both from epigraphy and numismatics to show that the Kṣatrapas, the successors of the Caṣṭana and Rudradāman, had retreated from Southern Gujarat and Malava during the Bhāraśiva period, but continued to hold their sway over Kathiawar and the north-eastern Gujarat until they were finally turned out by Candragupta Vikramāditya in the 4th century A.C.

RAM SHANKAR TRIPATHI.—*Sarnath*. The objects of interest at Sarnath have been described and an historical account of this ancient place has been given.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society,
vol. XXVII, pt. II (June, 1941)

- A. BANERJI-SASTRI.—*Sources of Indian History*—From 319 after Christ, the beginning of the Valabhi and the later Gupta Dynasty, till the beginnings of the Muhammadan conquests of India. Translated with notes from the original German of Lassen's *Indische Alterthumskunde* (1858).
- S. H. ASKARI.—*Nawab Munir-ud-Dowla—A Minister of Shah Alam*. This brief life-history of the Persian noble Munir-ud-Dowla, who was in the service of Alamgir and Shah Alam shows that though an able officer, he had harmed the Moghal cause by his policy of appeasing the East India Company.
- S. C. SARKAR.—*A Tibetan Account of Bengal*. Part II.—About Candragupta, Cāṇakya, Bindusāra and Śrī-Candra.

Journal of the Malayan Branch of Royal Asiatic Society,
vol. XVIII, 1 (1940)

- H. G. Q. WALES.—*Archæological Researches on Ancient Indian Colonisation in Malaya*.

Journal of the United Provinces Historical Society,
vol. XIV, pt. 1 (July, 1941)

- V. S. AGRAWALA.—*Rajghat Terracottas*. Amongst the varied materials that have been unearthed during the recent excavations at Rajghat in Benares, there are 2000 terracotta figurines including a large number of female heads and busts. They represent the best traditions of the art associated with the Gupta period, being specially remarkable for a variety of styles in hair-dressing as also for the paintings in lines and colours still preserved on some of the figurines.
- B. S. UPADHYA.—*The River Sindhu of the Mālavikāgnimitra*. There is a reference in Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra* to the routing of the Yavanas on the southern bank of the Sindhu at the hands of Vasumitra, a grandson of Puṣyamitra Śuṅga. It has been argued that this encounter between the Greeks and the Śuṅga prince must have taken place on a bend of the frontier Indus beyond Śākala and Taxila, and not on the bank of the Kalisindh, a small river near Bundelkhand. Incidentally, the north-

western extent of the Śuṅga empire is indicated in the paper. The circumstances leading to the invasion of Magadha by Khāravela, Demitrios, and Menander have also been discussed. Evidence is also adduced from the *Yugapurāṇa* against the contemporariness of Khāravela and Pusyamitra.

- C. SIVARAMAMURTI.—*Goddess Lakṣmī and her Symbols*. The elephants, lotus, lamps and *nidhis* (treasures) associated with a figure of Lakṣmī belonging to the Pallava sculpture suggest royalty, light, and prosperity.
- S. K. BANERJĪ.—*Kingship and Nobility in Humāyun's Time*. The condition of noblemen in Humāyun's time, with an account of their occupations, learning, and influence over the State has been discussed. The nobles had not yet been fully brought under the control of the king.
- KRISHNA CHARAN NIGAM.—*An unpublished Work on the Nawabs of Oudh*. The *Tarikh Mohtasham* by Mohtasham Khan deals with the history of Oudh from Burhanul Mulk's time in 1732 to the arrest of Munna Jan in 1837. The work throws considerable light on the social and political condition of the province during this period.
- UPENDRA NATH DEY.—*The Military Organisation of the Sultanate of Delhi (1210-1388)*.
- R. S. AVASTHY.—*The Delay in Humayun's Accession—An Explanation*. Relying on the testimony of Nizāmuddīn Ahmad Bakhshī, the writer of the note concludes that the four days' delay in Humayun's accession to the throne was due to his absence from the capital at the time of his fathers' death.
- K. C. SINHA.—*Baḍerā Copper-plate Inscription of king Madanapāla of Gāhaḍavāla Dynasty of Vikrama Era 1164 = 1107 A.D.* The inscription records the grant of the village of Sājā in the Paṭṭalā of Arureśa (in the Partabgarh district in Oudh) to a Brāhmaṇa by king Madanapāla of Kanauj.
- BANARSI PRASAD SAXENA.—*Ideals of Moghal Sovereigns*. The political ideals of the Moghal sovereigns developed with the change of conditions. The paper contains a historical survey of these ideals which, though following vigorously the policy of Imperialism, were permeated by humane principles and were not therefore inherently oppressive.
- New Indian Antiquary, vol. IV, no. 8 (June, 1941)
- E. P. RADHAKRISHNAN.—*Anūpasimha and some of His favourite Scholars*. Anūpasimha, a Rāthor prince ruling over Bikaner in the latter half of

the 17th century was a patron of learning. The paper gives an account of the various Sanskrit works written under his patronage by Ananta-bhaṭṭa, Bhadrarāma, Bhāva-bhaṭṭa, Maṇirāma Dīkṣita, Vaidyanātha, Nīlakaṇṭha Caturdhara and Rāmabhaṭṭa. Information regarding the family of Anūpaśiṅha has also been gathered in the article mainly from the works of the scholars mentioned above.

Ibid, vol. IV, no. 4 (July 1941)

- P. K. GODE.—*Some Notes on the History of the Fig (Ficus Carica) from Foreign and Indian Sources.*
- M. P. L. SASTRY.—*Mukundānandabhāṇa and its Author.* The *Mukundānandabhāṇa* is a play of one Act in Sanskrit. Its author Kāśīpati lived at the court of Nañjarāja of Mysore in the early part of the 18th century. Two other important works are known to have been written by him. One is named *Śravaṇānandini*, a commentary on Nañjarāja's *Sanḡita-gaṅgādhara*, and the other is called *Nayakalpataru*, also a commentary on the *Śabda* portion of the famous *Tattvacintāmaṇi* of Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya.

Philosophical Quarterly, vol. XVII, no. II (July, 1941)

- T. M. P. MAHADEVAN.—*Is the Gītā a Gospel of War?* The purpose of the paper is to interpret the teachings of the *Gītā* consistently with the doctrine of non-violence. While advocating war and the use of violence, Śrī Kṛṣṇa urged the fighting man to banish from his mind the spirit of *himsā*. Military operations sometimes indispensable must, according to the *Gītā*, be always free from any selfish desires and feelings of anger or hatred.
- P. NAGARAJA RAO.—*The Category of Difference in Vedānta.* The discussions centre round the attitude of the different systems of the Vedānta Philosophy towards the logical category of difference (भेद). The Advaita doctrine, based on the identity of the individual soul and Brahman, refutes the concept of difference, while the theistic schools of Vedānta recognise its ultimate reality.
- N. SIVARAMA SASTRY.—*Aesthetic Experience.* The subject-matter treated of in the paper is 'aesthetic experience' or *Rasa* as dealt with in the works of Sanskrit poetics by various schools of thought. The nature of such experience and the process of its elicitation in man have been discussed specially in accordance with the views of Abhinavagupta.

- T. R. ŚUNDARĀRAMAN.—*The Doctrine of Momentariness*. The polemical arguments introduced by the celebrated Viśiṣṭādvaita writer Veṅkaṭa-nātha Deśika in refutation of the Buddhist doctrine of momentariness (Kṣaṇikavāda) have been discussed.
- S. VITTALA SASTRI.—*Śaṅkara and His Modern Interpreters*. According to the writer of this note, Māyāvāda, as understood by the so-called followers of Śaṅkara, does not correctly represent the genuine doctrine of Avidyā taught by Śaṅkarācārya. Avidyā means 'the mutual superimposition of the self and the not-self and the mistaken transference of the characteristics of each to the other', while Māyā or Mūlāvidyā of the later writers constitutes the primeval nescience, which, though indescribable by nature, is the cause of every phenomenon giving rise to various kinds of ignorance. The defects of the Māyā theory have been pointed out.
- B. A. KRISHNASWAMY RAO.—*Theory of Relativity and the Sāṅkhya System*. This is an attempt to show that the conceptions of the realistic Sāṅkhya as represented by Vijñānabhikṣu in respect of space, time and matter find strong parallelism in the fundamental conclusions of the Theory of Relativity.

[illegible]

Bhojarāja-saccarita Nāṭaka
of
Vedānta-vāgīśa Bhaṭṭācārya
Introductory

During my search for Mss. of the *Sūrjanacarita*¹ in the archives of Europe, my attention was drawn to this work in August, 1939. A complete Ms. of this *Nāṭaka* is included in the India Office Collection. Thanks to the kindness of Dr. Randle, the Librarian, the Ms.² was sent to the Calcutta University Library for my use. Soon after my arrival in India in October, 1939, I had an opportunity of examining its contents. It is written on countrymade yellow paper in Nāgarī character. There are fourteen folios containing 239 lines of clear writing. The front page of the 1st folio is blank except for *Nāṭakabhōjabandha* and "450" in Nāgarī characters in ink and *Bhōjabandha* in pencil in Latin characters. The last page contains 3 lines of which a part of the 1st line and the 2nd and 3rd lines is written in different ink by another hand. Folio no. 10 contains on both sides 10 lines. All the pages of the other folios with these exceptions contain 9 lines. An unknown reader has in many places covered letters and sometimes words with ink and introduced corrections in the margin outside the written area on each folio. The work consists of two acts only. The real name of this small drama is given at the end of the first act as: *Bhojarāja-saccarita*.³ Each folio roughly measures 10¾" × 4¼" inches.

Its contents

This work in which verses occupy more space than prose, opens with Śrī-Gaṇeśāya namaḥ. Then follow 2 stanzas, in praise of

1 See my paper on *Sūrjanacarita* in *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 1938, pp. 370ff.

2 Sanskrit Ms. I.O. 584d (E4181).

3 The work is sometimes called *Bhōja-nibandha*; but nowhere *Bhōjabandha*.

the (Vyāsa)⁴ Cakradhara son of the Vyāsa Gopāla. At the end of the 1st act this Gopāla is called *Dharmādhyakṣa*. Cakradhara appears to have been the spiritual guide of the hero of the work, king Bhoja. Then follows praise of the author Vedānta-vāgīśa Bhaṭṭācārya⁵ and his *guru* Nārāyaṇa Sarasvatī.⁶ The latter used to reside in Vārāṇasī and rescued *Paramātma-vidyā* (Vedānta) from distress. Then follows eulogistic description of the hero, king Bhoja, who was lord of Vṛndāvatī⁷ and son of prince Sūrjana.⁸ The latter is also called "lord of Vṛndāvatī." Bhoja's mother was the *Kanaka-rājñī* Kamalā. Kamalā, after the death of her husband, Sūrajana, appears to have ruled her husband's state for some time during the minority of Bhoja. Bhoja is praised for his deeds and efficiency in administration. In one place the Sūtradhāra solemnly informs us that the administration of the hero reminded the people of the reign of the *pūrvatana* Bhoja. In another place, one of the *dramatis personae* declares that the hero became more famous by his deeds than the *prācīna* Bhoja. The hero is described in one place as *Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-caraṇakamalasevaka* and there is very little doubt about the Vaiṣṇava leanings of the author. The rest of the drama is full of names of various holy places in India and their respective merits. Among these the following may be mentioned, viz. Vārāṇasī,⁹ Jagannātha-kṣetra, Gaṅgā-sāgara, Setubandha-Rāmeśvara, Junction of Bhāgirathī and Kālindī, and Haridvāra.

Its author and his date

The colophon at the end of the last act runs as follows: *Iti Śrīman- Nārāyaṇa-Sarasvatī-sampūjya-caraṇa-kamala-yugala-Vedānta-*

4 A Brāhmaṇa who recites or expounds the *Purāṇas* in public.

5 The author is sometimes simply called Vāgīśa.

6 Dr. Satkari Mookerji suggests the identification of this Nārāyaṇa with Nārāyaṇa Sarasvatī, the author of the *Vārttika* on Saṅkara's *Bhāṣya* on *Brahmasūtra* (Calcutta Sanskrit Series).

7 On the identification of Vṛndāvatī see *infra*, p. 3, fn.

8 Sometimes the name is given as *Surijana*.

9 Sometimes *Kāśī*.

*vāgiśa -Bhaṭṭācārya -kṛtau Dharmādhyakṣa -Vyāsa-Śrī -Gopāla-nan-
dana-Vyāsa-Śrī Cakradharālaṁkṛta-Vṛndāvatyadhiśa*" *-Sūrajana-nan-
dana-Vṛndāvatyadhiśa-Śrī-Bhojarāja-saccarita-nāmnī Śrināṭake prath-
maṁkaḥ*. We know from this passage that the author was a disciple
of Nārāyaṇa-Sarasvatī. Elsewhere in the *Nāṭaka* this Nārāyaṇa is
described as a great authority on *Paramātmavidyā*. From this as
well as the title of his disciple (*Vedānta-vāgiśa*) it is reasonable
to assume that he was probably a great authority on Vedānta and
connected studies. It is strange that the work does not give the
real name of the author; Vedānta-vāgiśa and Bhaṭṭācārya can
only be taken as a title and a surname. He cannot be far removed
in date from the time of Candrasekhara, the author of the *Sūrjan-
acarita*. Candrasekhara was a contemporary of Akbar (1556-1605
A.D.)¹¹ and he lived in the court of Sūrjana, a feudatory prince of
the Timurid emperor. Our author seems to have been a court poet
of Bhoja, the son of Sūrjana. As such he must be placed in the
last quarter of the 16th or the first half of the 17th century. He
was apparently a Brāhmaṇa and had Vaiṣṇava leanings. But the
work does not reveal any details about the author's family or his
other works if any. As to his virtues as an author of a dramatic
composition, I can only mention that he has succeeded in writing
one without introducing any female character and the usual scenes
of erotic court intrigue. The author's style is sometimes vitiated
by the rhetorical fault called गर्भितता. Amongst his mannerisms
may be mentioned an unnecessary duplication of the interrogative
particle.

Its importance

The drama is important for a study of the *Sūrjanacarita*. Both
Bhoja and the Vyāsa Gopāla, father of Bhoja's *Guru* Cakradhara

10 Vṛndāvatī has been identified with the modern town of Bundi in the
Haraoti and Tonk Agency of Rajputana. See *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. XXI, p. 281.

¹¹ *Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. XIV, p. 379. By an unfortunate escapade
of the well known devil the date is wrongly printed as 1536-1605 A.D.

are mentioned in the last canto of the *Sūrjanacarita*. We are also told in this latter work that the *Vyāsa* Gopāla's son Cakradhara stood in front of Bhoja at the time of his coronation. Our present work does not supply any historical information about Bhoja. The "old Bhoja" mentioned above was possibly the Pratihāra Bhoja (c. 836-82 A.D.) or more probably the Paramāra prince of that name (c. 1010-1055 A.D.).¹² *Sūrjana*'s son is frequently praised in the *nāṭaka* in the meaningless conventional way so well known to the *prāśastikāras* of the early mediaeval kings of Northern India. In the *Sūrjanacarita* however, Bhoja is said to have conquered the *Gurjararājabhūmi*.¹³ If he really did so he must have achieved this result in the company of the armies of the House of Timur in which he, like his father, appears to have served. In the *Sūrjanacarita* he is called *Dillisenapuraskṛta* and is also credited with the conquest of the Suhmas, Vaṅgas, Vaidarbhas, Traigartas, Mālavas and the Gandhāras.¹⁴ But (if these claims had any historical basis) it is really surprising that our drama should remain silent on such brilliant achievements of the hero. Our author certainly occupied a position in the court of Bhoja entitling him to the fullest information about the achievements of his patron. But it is possible for one to argue that those sections of the *Sūrjanacarita* which describe these victories of Bhoja and which occur in the last canto of the work were composed at a date subsequent to that of the composition of the present drama.

Orthography and Script

As to orthographical peculiarities, it may be noted that the writer makes no distinction between *b* and *v*. Thus we have *Vrahmavid* for *Brahmavid*, *Vudheṣu* for *Budheṣu*, *Vudbena* for

¹² See Ray, *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Calcutta University Press, vol. I, p. 611; *ibid.*, vol. II, p. 927.

¹³ *Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. XIV, p. 378.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

Budhena, *Vrāhmī* for *Brāhmī*. Both *Rāmadāśa* and *Rāmadāsa*, are found; the former spelling appears to be a mistake of the scribe. In all cases where, *n*, *ṇ* and *ñ* combine with a consonant the writer has used the Anunāsika *m* for these letters. In fact *anusvāra* is indiscriminately used for all *anunāsikas* often violating the rule of Pāṇini अनुस्वारस्य ययि परसवर्णः. We have changed all *anusvāras* at the end by putting *म्* in its place. Occasionally consonants have been doubled after *r*, e.g. *Kirttiwarman*, *purovarttina*, *varivartti*, *vivarjita*; but the Ms. has also *sarvadā*, *Nisargasundara*, *dharmā*, *caturdāśa*, etc. where the consonant has not been duplicated after *r*. The script is of course as noted above Nāgarī. But a few letters show interesting variations of form.¹⁵ Thus the letter *bha* has sometimes been written as त *hu* as ऊ *hya* as य *stha* as ष etc.

Metre

There are in all 106 verses in the drama. Of these 66 are composed in *Anuṣṭubh*, 26 in *Upajāti*, 5 in *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*, 2 in *Svagatā*, three each in *Vasantatilakā* and *Vamśasthā* and one in *Ratnoddhatā*.

I conclude these very brief introductory remarks by quoting the following which occurs at the end of the Ms. in a different hand :

*Surajananaṁdana-Vṛndāvatyadhiśa-Śrī-Bhojarājasaccarita-
nāmni Śrī-nāṭake dvitīyomkaḥ. Samāpto granthaḥ.*

It seems very probable that this was written by the same person who, while reading this Ms., had suggested a number of corrections

¹⁵ Compare Bendall, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Cambridge, 1883, Table of Letters, bottom line, Library Mark 1355; date 1576, the letter *bha*, also Bühler, *Indische Palaeographie*, Strassburg, 1896, plates: Tafel V, line 33, column XIII, the letter *bha*; Tafel VI. Handschriften, line 51, column XVI, the letter *stha*; on the same Tafel line 47, column XIX, the letters *hu*; on the same Tafel, line 38, column XIV, the letter *bha*.

and had written his emendations on the margin around the written space of the folios. He had often smudged what he thought to be incorrect in the original with ink so that the version as known to the writer of the Ms. has often been completely lost. Though his corrections are sometimes reasonable enough yet they are not always so and on several occasions I had to restore the original reading of the Ms. As an instance of the mistakes the reader may be asked to note the fact that in the passage cited above *Vṛndāvatyadhīśa* is incorrectly written as *Ṣṭamḍāvatyadhīśa*. This incorrect form actually occurs in the text at the beginning of the first act. A comparison of the data as contained in the *Sūrjanacarita* as also in other parts of the drama leaves us in no doubt that Lord of Vṛndāvatī was the correct title of the kings of the line of Bhoja.¹⁶

H. C. RAY

¹⁶ In editing this text I have received material help from Dr. S. K. Mookerjee, M.A., Ph.D., and also from Mr. A. Nag, Pandit Aniruddha Jha, Pandit Panchanan Bhattacharya and Mr. P. C. Majumdar, M.A.

श्रीभोजराज-सञ्चरित नाटकम्

श्रीगणेशाय नमः

श्रीमच्चक्रधरः सतां सुरतरुर्जीयादयं सर्वदा

सौभाग्यावधिभूमिदेवतिलको गोपालो व्यासात्मजः¹ ।

संख्यावत्प्रथितोऽसतां मदहरः संतापहारी नृणां

श्रीमद्भोजमहीपतेरुदयदो धर्मो वपुष्मानिव ॥१॥

यद्वाग्याममलं जनस्य सुखदं पीयूषमास्ते प्रियं

यद्भाले रुचिरा शुभाक्षरततिर्धात्रा विचित्रा कृता ।

यत्पाणौ कमले द्विजार्पणजलैराद्रं सति श्रीमति

याच्चाकृद्² भ्रमरावली महवती सोयं कृती चक्रभृत् ॥२॥

[नान्यन्ते सूत्रधारः ।]^{2a} अलमतिविस्तरेण । इदानीं खलु चतुर्दशभुवनाधीशेन सकलफल-
दायिना निसर्गसुन्दरेण सर्वान्तर्यामिणा श्रीमता श्रीकृष्णेन लीलाविग्रहधारिणेति प्रेरितोऽस्मि ॥
यत्तावत् सूरिजननन्दनस्य धर्मात्मनो भोजस्य वृन्दावल्यधीशस्य³ राज्ञः सञ्चरितं सभ्येषु
सञ्चरितेषु सम्यगभिनीय संदर्शयेति ।

[आशासु नयनमुन्मील्य⁴ । सहर्षं ॥] अहो परमचतुरा अस्मदभिनयं वीक्षितुं
निर्मतृसराः सभ्याः संप्राप्ता एव ।

[प्रविश्य नटः ।] अलागतानां सभ्यानां कः स्वार्थः । अस्मन्महिम्⁵ वृद्धिरेव । तथाहि—

महिमानं परस्यैव

कर्तुमिच्छन्तः^{5a} आहताः ।⁶

1 मूले “त्मज्” but the ū is in another ink. The unknown reader (Abbrevia-
tion U. R.) has written above व्यासात्मजः । 2 मूले याच्चाकृत् ।

2a Throughout the text stage directions have been placed in square brackets.

3 मूले वृन्दावल्यधीशस्य । Vṛndāvatī has been identified with modern Bundī in
Rajputana, see above, p. 3 fn. 8a.

4 मूले उल्लमील्य ।

5 मूले महितः

5a ...तः इति मूले । But the U. R. has placed ink over h.

6 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

निर्मत्सराः शुभाचाराः

सभ्या यान्ति सभाङ्गणम् ॥

सूत्रधारः । अलमतिविस्तरेण । विवक्षितमेव कथ्यताम् ।

नटः [सोत्साहम् ।] इदमेव विवक्षितं यदावाभ्यां सभ्यानुरञ्जनं कर्तव्यं तत् केन साधनेनेति⁷ ।

सूत्रधारः । कच्चिन्न जानासि किं शृणु । इदानीं वेदान्तवागीशभट्टाचार्येण निबन्धो रचितोऽस्ति ।

नटः⁸ । स किं⁹ साधनम् ।

सूत्रधारः ।¹⁰ कः संशयः ।

नटः [सहर्षं] । कच्चिन्नाम किंनामायं निबन्धः ।

सूत्रधारः । श्रीमद्भोजसच्चरितनामायम् ।

नटः [सविस्मयं] । अये एतन्निबन्धरचनकाराणां वेदान्तवागीशभट्टाचार्यस्य किं विमलं ज्ञानम् ।¹¹

सूत्रधारः ।¹² कः संशयः । तथाहि ।

शान्त्यादिसन्दर्भमुपेत्य पुरयैः

पुराकृतैर्दानदयं गुरुं यः ।

नारायणं ब्रह्मविद् मुनीन्द्रं

संसेव्य भातीह परात्मविज्ञः ॥¹³

कदापि केनापि कलिः कृतो नो

पाण्डित्यमानेन समं बुधेषु ।

संपश्यता सर्वजनेषु सन्तं

पीताम्बरं येन बुधेन सोऽयम् ॥¹⁴

नटः [सविस्मयं] । अस्य वेदान्तवागीशभट्टाचार्यस्य ब्रह्मविन्मुनीन्द्रः किं नारायणो गुरुः ।

सूत्रधारः [सानन्दं] । अये न जानासि किम् । शृणु । वाराणस्यां गृहीतलीलावतारो नारायणो मुनीन्द्रः ।

नटः । [भक्तिभावितं तं नारायणं पुरः पश्यन्निव¹⁵ सानन्दं] । किंप्रयोजनो वाराणस्यां गृहीतलीलावतारो नारायणः ।

7 सान्त्वतेनेनेति इति मूले ।

8 नटः सकिं । in the original Ms.

9 U. R. has taken off the full stop with different ink.

10 No full stop in original.

11 The Ms. seems to have जानं ।

12 No full stop in original.

13 मूले एका रेखा ।

14 मूले एका रेखा ।

15 Ms. as corrected by U. R. reads पश्यन्तिवः, but the original seems to be right.

सूत्रधारः [तमेव^{15a} नारायणं ध्यायन् सप्रसादं] । कच्चिदन्न न जानासि नारायणलीला-
वतारप्रयोजनम् । शृण्वति प्रयोजनम् । तथाहि ।

काले कलौ गतघृणे¹⁶ कृपयन्नयं च

कूरं तपश्चरति ब्रह्मविदो¹⁷ मुनीन्द्रान् ।

रत्नन्तृशंसकृतिभिर्विबुधैर्विपन्नो

गोरूपिणीमिव द्रुतां^{17a} परमात्मविद्याम् ॥¹⁸

नटः । [नेपथ्याभिमुखमवलोक्य] । भो रक्षाचार्य यस्य कवेः साक्षान्नारायणो गुरुः स
वागीशो यस्य राज्ञो भोजस्य निबन्धं कुरुते स भोजनृपतिः कमनीयकीर्तिरेव ।

सूत्रधारः । [सानन्दं सभ्यवदनान्यवलोकयन् ।]¹⁹ अये नटवर किं नावगच्छसि
राजालङ्कार एव भोजराज इति । तथाहि—

वृन्दावतीशो जगति प्रसिद्धः

शौर्येण^{19a} दानेन जनावनेन ।

यशोनिधिः सूरजनो महीन्द्र-

स्तदात्मजो राजति भोजराजः ॥²⁰

नटः²¹ । अये भोजराजस्य सूक्ष्मं सञ्चरितं²² नीत्युपेतं दुर्बोधं किं विदितम् ।

सूत्रधारः ।²³ [साभिमानं²³] । भो नटवर प्रजापालनादि वृन्दावत्यधीशस्य²⁴ भोज-
राजस्य सम्यक् ज्ञातमेव । तथाहि—

तथा प्रजां पालयतीह भोजो

यथा प्रजाः²⁵ पूर्वतनं स्मरन्ति ।

भोजं महीन्द्रं खलु चौरभीतेः

खवीर्यतो धर्ममतिः कृपालुः²⁶ ॥

[प्रफुल्लनयन ऐन्द्रीं दिशमवलोक्य²⁷ ।] अये वृन्दावत्यधीशस्य²⁸ सत्कीर्ति-
मुद्गायन्तौ^{28a} पुंस्कोकिलाविवैतौ ।

15a मूले सूत्रधारस्तमेव ।

16 घृ is covered with ink and is not distinct.

17 Corrected reading तत्त्वविदौ (U. R.),

17a Prof. D. M. Bhattacharya suggests हतां for द्रुतां 18 मूले एक रेखा ।

19 In original there is no full stop after अवलोकयन् ।

19a मूले शौर्येण

20 मूले एका रेखा ।

21 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

22 Here in Ms. सञ्चरितं but U. R. has made it as above.

23 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

24 Ms. reads वृन्दावत्यधीशस्य ।

25 प्रजां in original.

26 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

27 मूले ऐन्द्रीदिशन् ।

28 Ms. reads वृन्दावत्यधीशस्य ।

28a मूले मुद्गायन्तौ

तदस्मात्²⁹ स्थानादपसर्तव्यमेवावाभ्यामिति³⁰ वरम् । यतः—

स्वस्मात् समागच्छति सभ्यमुख्ये

स्थातुं न शक्यं खलु बोधपूर्णं ।

पूर्वं सभासङ्गतिनाधिकेपि

जनेन मानाधिकमन्सरेण ॥

[इति निष्क्रान्तौ तौ ॥] प्रस्तावना ।

[ततः प्रविशति वाणीपतिः नयनानन्दश्च] ।

वाणीपतिः ।³¹ अये नयनानन्द [इति सानन्दं सम्बोध्य] ।

तां वाणीं करवाणि वाणि ललितां भोजस्य राज्ञो गुणा

वर्यन्ते सुधया समा³² मधुरया यस्यां प्रिया भूभुजाम् ।

इत्येवं ननु भारती कृतनतिः संप्रार्थिता भूरिशः

प्रादाद्वाञ्छितमस्तु ते वरममुं मातेव वाग्देवता ॥³³

तथाहि—

भोजसंगरमवेक्ष्य धन्विनो

भीष्मदेवसदृशस्य³⁴ वेपते ।

सायकै र्पुतनौ प्रवर्षतो

मानसं पबिसमं मुहुर्मुहुः ॥³⁵

नयनानन्दः [सगर्वं कटाक्षेण³⁶ बोध्य स्वमतं*] । अये कल्याणबुद्धे वाणीपते तव सारदानुग्रहेण ललिता वाणी कथमिव न भवेत् । युक्तं चैतत् तथाहि ।

या वीणां दधती करेण रुचिरां नादं कलं कुर्वती

विश्वस्यापि लुनाति जाड्यमखिलं ब्राह्मी विधत्ते मतिम् ।

सा भक्तैर्हृदि भाविता गजगतिनांपेक्षते सर्वथा

वर्णानामभिमानीनी खरवतां राकेशरम्यानना³⁷ ॥³⁸

29 In the original, there is a full stop after तदस्मात् ।

30 In the original it is मेवाभ्यामिति

31 रये इति मूले । U. R. seems to have corrected it into रये with light ink.

32 समाङ्ग इति मूले ; but “ङ्ग” has been covered with light ink by U.R.

33 मूले एका रेखा ।

34 In the original it is सदृशस्य ; but U. R. has tried as it seems to add र to द ।

35 मूले एका रेखा ।

36 कटाक्षेण इति मूले ; but U. R. has covered “क्ष” with ink and added below

डा” * मूले खगतं

37 There is विसर्ग at the end which has been covered with ink by U. R.

38 मूले एका रेखा ।

वाणीपतिः ।^{38a} [तदुक्तिमाकर्ण्य सन्तुष्यन् खगतं] ।

भवादृशाः³⁹ सन्ति गुणैकबुद्ध्यः

परस्य दोषानपि कुर्वते गुणान् ।

सूक्ष्मान्⁴⁰ गुणान् स्थूलतमांश्च ते नराः

सतां हि बुद्धिगुणमेव गाहते ॥⁴¹

नयनानन्दः । अये⁴² वाणीपते श्रीमान् भोजराजो वदान्यः

श्रीमद्भोजपतेर्दानैर्द्विजाः स्वर्गगतस्पृहाः ।

संप्राप्तपरमानन्दाः पूर्णसर्वमनोरथाः ॥⁴³

वाणीपतिः । बत मतिमन्नयनानन्द नावेदि । यदिह प्राचीनादपि भोजात्⁴⁴ सकलराज-
तिलकः^{44a} सूरिजननन्दनः श्रीमान् वृन्दावल्यधीशो भोजनामाऽवनीशः समधिकः ख्यात इति ।

तथाहि—

स पादभोजः खलु कथ्यते जनैः⁴⁵

दानेन मानेन गुणादरेण ।

स्वसेवकानामपि भूमिभाजां

वृन्दावतीशः प्रथितश्च^{45a} भोजात् ॥⁴⁶

पुनरपि नयनानन्दः । साधु साधु निगदितम् । [इति वाणीपतिमभिनन्द्य ।]

परदुःखासहो भोजो वीक्षते यं कृपादृशा ।⁴⁷

तं पद्मा न जहातीशो भगवानिव धर्मेवित् ॥⁴⁸

पुनरपि वाणीपतिः [नयनानन्दं सानन्दमवलोक्य] । भो नयनानन्द कुशलेन श्रीमता
नावगम्यते कारणानुरूपं प्रायः कार्यम् ।^{48a} कार्यं वृन्दावल्यधीशो भोजराजः । कारणं तु
वृन्दावल्यधीशः सूरिजनाधीशः स च सूरिजनाधीशः ।

यथा गङ्गा^{48b} तथा विष्णुं तथा विप्रं समर्चयन् ।

हरिभावमगाद्गोरो राजभुक्तियुतः कृती ॥⁴⁹

38a मूले वाणपतिस्तदुक्ति

39 Ms. reads भवादृशाः ।

40 Ms. reads सूक्ष्मैः ; but U. R. has covered सूक्ष्मैः with ink and has put in the left margin कृशा suggesting thereby कृशान् in the place of सूक्ष्मैः ।

41 मूले एका रेखा ।

42 Ms. reads अये ।

43 मूले एका रेखा ।

44 The original Ms. reads भोजन्व ; then the U. R. made it भोजन्न (?) .

44a मूले तिलक ।

45 The U. R. has changed it to “यो (दानेन) ।

45a मूले प्रथिताच्च ।

46 मूले एका रेखा ।

47 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

48 मूले एका रेखा ।

48a मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

48b मूले गङ्गा ।

49 मूले एका रेखा ; Ms. reads युक्तः ।

पुनरपि नयनानन्दः [सानन्दं वाणीपतिमवलोक्य] ।⁵⁰ अये वाणीपते पर्येति^{50a} अस्य श्रीभोज-
राजस्याम्बा श्रीसूरिजनस्य पट्टमहिषो पतिदेवता कनकराज्ञी कमलेति ।

वाणीपतिः [कमलास्मरणपूर्णमानसः सगर्व] ।⁵¹ अये नयनानन्द सुप्रसिद्धमेवैतत् ।
तथाहि⁵²—

यावन्तमकरोद्धर्मं यद्रूपं वसुधाधिपः ।
महिष्यपि तथा धर्ममकरोच्च पतिव्रता ॥⁵³

तदनु कदाचित् ।

भोजे यया सूरिजनस्य लोको
निरस्तशोको वसुधाधिपस्य ।

वाराणसीं प्राप्तवतः पुरारेः

स्वरूपभाजः सहयानभाजः ॥⁵⁴

नयनानन्दः [स्वमतं] ।^{54a} भो वाणीपते पुनः पुनर्भोजगुणवर्णने सतां जायता नोचिता ।
यस्माद्धेतोः ।

सन्तः स्मरन्ति सततं हरिदास्यभाजान्^{54b}

विश्वेश्वरस्य सगुणस्य गुणाननन्तान् ।⁵⁵

हित्वापि कार्यशतकं गतमत्सरास्ते

पीयूषपानरसिका हरिदासगोष्ठ्याम् ॥⁵⁶

अयं च श्रीभोजराजो^{56a} मुख्यतो⁵⁷ हरिभजनशीलः । तथाहि ।

पित्रोर्हरेः पूजनमुख्यधर्मो

यशोधनाराधितपादपीठः ।

श्रीभोजराजो नरवीरराजो

विराजते स्वात्मकुलावतंसः ॥⁵⁸

[अपि च वाणीपतिरपि⁵⁹ भोजस्य पितृहरिभजनं समाकर्ष्य सोल्लासं] ।⁶⁰ भो नयनानन्द
तर्हि वृन्दावत्यधीशस्य भोजराजस्य सर्वसम्पदां सद्भावं समुचित एव ।⁶⁰ तथाहि—

यतः प्रसन्ने ननु नन्दसूनौ

किमप्यलभ्यं न भवेत् सुखाब्धौ ।

स्वशक्तिमन्तं कमलाकरोयं

करोति लोकं शरणं प्रपन्नम् ॥

50 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

50a मूले पर्येति

51 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

52 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

53 मूले एका रेखा ।

54 मूले एका रेखा । Ms. reads सहयान भाजा

54a स्वगतमिति मूले

54b मूले ०भाजां

55 मूले द्वे रेखे ।

56 मूले एका रेखा ।

56a मूले श्रीभोजराजः ।

57 In Ms. "तो" is smudged with light ink.

58 मूले एका रेखा ।

59 मूले एका रेखा अस्ति ।

60 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

अपि च परयेतन्नयनानन्द ।

ध्रुवप्रह्लादमुख्यास्ते हरिणा ये यथाकृताः ।

तत् सर्वं विदितं सर्वैर्भक्तपालनशालिना ॥⁶¹

किं चैवं तावत् । नयनानन्दोपि । कुशलमते वाणीपते चित्तं चारुचरितं वृन्दावल्यधीशस्य भोज-
राजस्य बाल्यमारभ्य बहुभ्यो बहुकृत्वः श्रीमज्जगन्नाथक्षेत्रे श्रुतवानस्मि पूर्वम् तथाहि कश्चित् ।

अल्पोपि सूर्यचरणौः किल भोजराजो

मत्या विशुद्ध इव भाति गुणावदातः⁶² ।

यो मन्यते [जगति यत्परयोषितं वै

स्वां मातरं जितमना हरिपूजितांग्रिः ॥]⁶³

पुनरप्यन्यः कश्चित् ।⁶⁴

कृतेप्यनिष्टे खलु येन केन

स्वसेवकेनापि विकारमल्पम् ।

करोति नो भूपतिरेष भोजः^{64a}

स्वनन्दनेनेव पिता वरिष्ठः ॥⁶⁵

अपिच । [वाणीपतिरपि स्वयमार्यः स्वहितं विचार्य] ।⁶⁶ अये नयनानन्द सर्वास्ववस्थासु
सर्वैर्धनश्याम एव भजनीयः । तथाहि⁶⁷—

ससेव्यः सर्वदा सर्वैः संपत्स्वपि विपत्स्वपि ।

शौरिः सर्वजनावासो भक्तानामखिलप्रदः ॥⁶⁸

अतः कारणादावाभ्यां द्वारकां प्रति गत्वा श्रीकृष्ण एव भजनीयः । [इति निष्क्रान्तौ⁶⁹
तौ वन्दिवरौ ।] [अपि च तदानीमेव प्रचेतसो दिशः सकाशात् करुणाकरः भूरिलाभः*
रामदासश्च^{69a} प्रविशन्ति^{69b} वैष्णवाः ।]

करुणाकरः ।⁷⁰ अये भूरिलाभ यस्य वृन्दावल्यधीशस्य श्रीभोजराजस्य सर्वेषु पुष्करादि-
तीर्थेषु जनैः सच्चरितं गीयते तस्य सच्चरितं त्वया वर्यताम् । यतः सच्चरितवर्णनमेव सतो
जन्मनः साफल्यम् । तथाहि—⁷¹

61 मूले एका रेखा ।

62 मूले “गुणावतः” ; U. R. has added “दा” above the writing space on the Folium.

63 The portion in brackets is the corrected reading by U. R. in different ink above the writing space of the Folium. He has covered the original writing with ink.

64 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

64a Ms. omits *h*.

65 मूले एका रेखा ।

66 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

67 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

68 मूले एका रेखा ।

69 अत्र मूल रेखा अस्ति

69a Ms. reads रामदास

69b मूले प्रविशन्ति ।

* मूले एका रेखा ।

70 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

71 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

सन्तः साधु गृणन्त्येव सतां चरितमादताः ।

हरिभक्तिविधातृणां शैवधीनां स्वसङ्गिषु ॥

[भूरिलाभः]^{71a} । अये करुणाकर साध्वेवोपदिशसि । यतः—

अनुशास्ति परं यो वै हितं सत्यं सुखावहम् ।

स धन्यः पुरुषो लोके कथ्यते करुणाकरः ॥

[पुनः करुणाकरः] । अये रामदास शुद्धस्त्वम् [इति⁷² सम्बोध्य स्वाशयं] । श्रीमत्-
सूरजनन्दनो वृन्दावल्यधीशो भोजराजः किमिदानीं कुरुते ।

अये करुणाकर । प्रजापालनमेव ।

राज्ञां प्रजापालनमेव धर्मो

मुख्यः प्रदिष्टो मुनिभिः स्मृतिर्ज्ञः ।

यतो हि शुद्धान्वयजातभूपाः

प्रजावनं कुर्वत एव सम्यक् ।

अपि च

पुनः करुणाकरः [हर्षपरिपूर्णात्मानसो नेपथ्याभिमुखमवलोक्य] अये रामदास धर्मज्ञ
[इति सम्बोध्य] श्रीमान् भोजराजः किं दुष्टजननिग्रहं न विधत्ते किम् । •

पुनः रामदासः [सकोपं] भोः करुणाकर कुतो विदितमेतत् । विधत्त एव दुष्टजननिग्रह-
मिति ब्रूमः । तथाहि—

पालनं खलु सतामभयं च^{72b} दुष्टचौरजनतोऽवनिपस्य ।

कार्यमेव [कथितं मुनिभिश्च]⁷³ निग्रहं न हि विना [जगति स्यात्⁷⁴] ॥⁷⁵

[इतस्ततो भूरिलाभः परमया मुदा पूर्णचित्तो विलोकयन् । रामदासं सम्बोध्य स्वाशयं]

चन्द्रश्चन्दनकर्पूरं^{75a} हंसाश्च भोजकीर्तितः ।

लोकलयविलासिन्या सङ्गता मन्य इत्यहम् ॥⁷⁶

अपि च

71a Not in Ms.

72 मूले शुद्धस्त्विति ।

72a रामदास इति मूले ।

72b मूले य ।

73 Portion within brackets is the corrected reading of U. R. The original which is covered with light ink seems to be “सततं सुरैः स्मृतं ।” U. R. reads ऋषिभिस्त

74 Portion within brackets is the corrected reading of U. R. The original which is also smudged with light ink seems to be नुसिदन्ति(?) ।

75 मूले एका रेखा ।

75a मूले चन्द्रचन्दनकर्पूर इति

76 मूले एका रेखा ।

भोजराजं समाश्रित्य चालमोजो जगन्नये ।

प्रसिद्धिमगमत् स्तुत्यामिति^{76a} मन्ये यशोधनम् ॥⁷⁷

करुणाकरः । [पुनः पुनर्मैत्रकमानन्दोलयन्] अये भूरिलाभ वैष्णवाग्रथ [इति सम्बोध्य
सविनयं स्वाशयं] अपि च

न गर्वमाविष्कुरुते^{77a} रणे वहन्नसि स्फुरन्तं निशितं नराधिपः ।

सहस्रबाहुं मनसा स्मरन् मुहुः रिपूनसंख्यान् शमयन्तमुद्धतान् ॥⁷⁸

भूरिलाभोपि पुनः पुनः^{78a} अये रामदास सारासारविवेकचतुर [इति^{78b} सम्बोध्य सानन्दं
स्वाशयं] अपि च ।

सर्वल भूतेषु वसन्तमोशं⁷⁹ पुराणमोञ्चं किल भोजराजः ।

वृन्दावतीशो महनीयकीर्तिर्विबुध्यते मत्सरलेशहीनः ॥⁸⁰

करुणाकरोपि । [पुनः पुनः स्मितं कुर्वन्निव आयुष्मन् भूरिलाभेति सादरं सम्बोध्य
स्वकलाकौशलमाविष्कुर्वन्निव स्वाशयं^{80a}] अपि च ।

नामकर्मकृदयं⁸¹ किल भोजः सत्यवागिति पिता नहि चित्तम् ।

भुक्तिमुक्तिफलभाक् कृतपुण्यः सूरिरूपजन इत्यभिनन्द्यः ॥⁸²

रामदासोपि [पुनः कृपाकटाक्षैः सभ्यानुत्साहयन्निव^{82a} करुणाकरं सकलराजकलावर्णन-
कुशलेति सम्बोध्य] शृणु । श्रीमन्

चतुर्मुखकृतां संख्यां वसुधो नो वसुप्रदः ।

सहते भोजराजोयमल्पदानपराङ्मुखः ॥

करुणाकरोपि । [स्वसुजनतां प्रकटयन्निव हरिदासं भुजाभ्यां गूढमालिङ्गन्निव]^{82b} हरिदास
यथार्थनामन् । [इति मधुराक्षरं] ।

न श्रूयते दीनवचः कदापि वृन्दावतीशः⁸³ किल याचकस्य ।⁸⁴

पूर्वं प्रदत्तेन समृद्धिभाजस्तं चातकं छिद्रगतं^{84a} विहाय ॥⁸⁵

76a मूले स्तुत्यामिति । 77 मूले एका रेखा । 77a मूले ०माविः कुरुते ।

78 मूले एका रेखा । 78a Ms. reads पुनरये । 78b Ms. reads चतुरेति ।

79 In original Ms. ... मीश्वरं; U. R. has covered श्वरं with light ink and added
“श्व” to correct the chhanda which is उपजाति (eleven pādas) and not बंशस्थ
(twelve pādas).

80 मूले एका रेखा ।

80a मूले स्वगतं ।

81 “नामकर्महृदयं” इति मूले । But U. R. has rightly corrected it as above.

82 मूले एका रेखा ।

82a मूले सभ्यान् सोत्साहयन्निव ।

82b मूले ०मालिङ्गयन्निव ।

83 मूले “वृन्दावतीशा” ।

84 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

84a मूले छिद्रगतं

85 मूले एका रेखा ।

भूरिलाभोपि । [पुनःपुनर्हृष्यन्निव^{85a} कंजप्रफुल्ललोचनः] शुभाचार करुणाकर । [इति सम्बोध्य स्वाशयं ।*]

जातं शरण्यं न जहाति भोजः कृतापरार्धं युधि वासवः सः^{85b} ।

शरण्यरक्षा कुलधर्म एषां वृन्दावतीशां जगतीपतीनाम् ॥⁸⁶

करुणाकरोपि । [पुनः पुनः सम्भ्यान् नमन्] भो रामदास [इति सम्बोध्य स्वाशयं* ।]

संलक्ष्य शत्रुं महनीयवीर्यमजेयमिच्छा कपटाश्रयेण⁸⁷ ।

वृन्दावतीशस्य न जातु जेतुं जनापवादाद्व्यथते हि साधुः ॥⁸⁸

रामदासोपि । [पुनः पुनः] भूरिलाभ श्रीमत्पीताम्बरचरणसरोरुहयुगमकरन्दपान-परमरसिक । [इति सम्बोध्य स्वाशयं]* ।⁸⁹

न ज्ञायते भोजपतेः कदापि चिकीर्षितं बुद्धिमतापि⁹⁰ किञ्चित् ।

विश्वेश्वरस्येव परेण सम्यक् कार्योपलम्भेऽसति नीतिदृष्टौ ॥⁹¹

करुणाकरोपि । [रामदासमालक्ष्य स्वाभिकाञ्चितं] ।

वृन्दावतीशस्य पयोनिधेश्व समत्वमिष्टं विबुधैस्तथाहि ।

पयोनिधिर्भोजपतिश्च वेलातयेति नैवात्र जनावनाय ॥⁹²

भूरिलाभोपि । [रामदासमालक्ष्य] ।

भयं न लेभिरे केचिच्छत्रुभ्यस्ते महीश्वराः ।

विमुखा भोजराजाश्चेद्⁹³ भयं विन्दन्ति दारुणं ॥⁹⁴

न दृष्टो न श्रुतः कोपि भोजराजसमः कलौ ।

राजन्यानां रणोत्साहं दधन् मूर्तिधरं कृती ॥⁹⁵

रामदासोपि । [पुनः पुनः करुणाकराशयमालक्ष्य] करुणाकर नरवीर । [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमनीषितं] । अपि च ।

न धनेन न राज्येन न चाश्वैर्न च⁹⁶ सेवया ।

यथा तुष्यति धर्मेण भोजराजो महाभुजः ॥⁹⁷

85a मूले हृष्यन्निव

85b मूले वासवस्य

86 मूले एका रेखा ।

86a Ms. reads हननी०

87 The U. R. has changed the last letter into "स्" into "ण" ।

88 मूले एका रेखा ।

* मूले खगतं

89 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

90 The U. R. has cut down the *anusvāra* of 'मतां' ।

91 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

92 मूले एका रेखा ।

93 मूले राजाश्चेऽभयं ।

94 मूले एका रेखा ।

95 मूले एका रेखा ।

96 मूले...नैव ।

97 महीभुजः इति मूले । मूले एका रेखा ।

करुणाकरोपि । [पुनः पुनर्भूरिलाभमभिनन्द्य सादरं] ।⁹⁸

औन्नत्यमुचितं⁹⁹ भाति परवीरभयावहम् ।

स्ववंशसदृशं लोके भोजस्य वसुधाभृतः ॥

भूरिलाभोपि । [पुनर्नैपथ्याभिमुखमवलोक्य रामदासं] जय जय प्रमोद । [इति सादरं सम्बोध्य सानुरागं] ।

सत्त्वेन रहितो राजा लोकस्योक्तिर्गताऽधुना ।

संबोध्य सात्त्विकं भोजं स्थितस्य वसुधाधिपम्¹⁰⁰ ॥

करुणाकरोपि । [वृन्दावतीशसच्चरितम् अभिनवमिव¹⁰¹ श्रव्यं पुनः पुनः शृग्वन्विवक्षितं रामदासमालक्ष्य] ।

यद्ध्यानेप्यरियोषितां¹⁰² प्रचलनं गर्भा भजन्तेऽखिलाः

स्वस्थानाज्जनताप्रियस्य जनतां सौख्योत्सुकां कुर्वतः ।

स्वात्मानं जुषतः परानवनिपान् मान्यान् विधातुर्भृशं

तस्यास्तु¹⁰³ क्षितिपोत्तमस्य सततं भोजस्य कीर्तिः स्थिरा ॥¹⁰⁴

अग्रे विष्णुभजनैक चेतमौ । वयं प्राच्यां गङ्गासागरमवगाढ्य श्रीमज्जगन्नाथमर्चयितुं यास्यामः ।

इति निष्क्रान्तास्त्रयोपि ते ॥

॥ इति श्रीमन्नारायण-सरस्वती-संपूज्य-चरणकमलयुगल-वेदान्तवागीश-भट्टाचार्यकृतौ धर्मा-
ध्यक्ष-व्यास-श्रीगोपालनन्दनव्यास-श्रीचक्रधरालङ्कृत-वृन्दावत्यधीश-सुरजननन्दन-वृन्दावत्यधीश-
श्रीभोजराज-सच्चरितनाम्नि श्रीनाटके प्रथमोऽङ्कः ॥

98 मूले सादरं ।

99 ०एत्य० इति मूले । But U. R. with a clumsy pen and different ink seems to have corrected it into औन्न० ।

100 मूले एका रेखा ।

101 अभिनवामिव इति मूले । But U. R. has covered the आकार on व with light ink.

102 यत्स्मरणे इति मूले । U. R. has covered with light ink an unnecessary रेखा in the Ms. after ०योषितां ।

103 मूले तस्यां ।

104 मूले एका रेखा ।

॥ अथ द्वितीयोऽङ्कः प्रारभ्यते ॥

॥ [ततो भिन्नदेशस्थितौ निसर्गसुन्दरोऽरविन्दलोचनश्च द्विजवरो प्रविशतः । निसर्ग-
सुन्दरस्तावत्] अरविन्दलोचन द्विजवर¹⁰⁵ यतः स्थानात् समागतो भवान् तत्स्थानं स्तुन्यम् ।
यथा ।

सूर्यबिम्बं विनिर्गच्छदिन्द्राशायाः¹⁰⁶ प्रगे द्विजाः ।

दृष्ट्वा स्तुवन्ति तामैन्द्रीं हेमाद्रिशिखरद्युतिम् ॥

अरविन्दलोचनः । अये निसर्गसुन्दर धर्मवत्सल । [इति सम्बोध्य स्वाशयं]^{106a}

अवेक्ष्य दूराद् द्विजघातपापाद्^{106b} यमाशु रामेण कृतं विमुक्तः ।

तव स्थितिर्मे¹⁰⁷ किल सेतुबन्धे नरोऽनुतापी कृतपूर्वपुण्यात् ॥

तत्र रामेश्वरो देवः पूज्यते स्म मयाऽन्वहम् ।

इच्छता रामसान्निध्यं सतामपि सुदुर्लभम् ॥¹⁰⁸

निसर्गसुन्दरः । [पुनः पुनर्मनसि रामेश्वरं ध्यायन् परमं सुखितः सगर्वम्]^{108a} अये
श्रीमन् अरविन्दलोचन [इति सम्बोध्य] कमधिकमर्थमिच्छता परमपुरुषार्थसाधनं सेतुबन्धं
विहायात् श्रीमता समागतं । यतः ।

सन्त्यक्त बहवो भूम्यामवतारा हरेः कलाः ।

कृष्णदाशरथी पूर्णौ तत्रापितु परः परः ॥¹⁰⁹

अ पिच ।

विशिष्य ते यथा सेतौ¹¹⁰ पूजा सम्पद्यते तव ।

न तथाऽन्यत् रामस्य विहन्तुर्भक्तसङ्कटम् ॥¹¹¹

104a मूले निसर्गसुन्दरोः अरविन्दलोचनश्च

105 द्विजवर्यतः इति मूले । U. R. has corrected it into "द्विजवर्यकुतः" । He
has placed "कु" above the writing space on the Folio.

106 U. R. had covered with light ink ०च्छदि० and added on the left margin
"तमि" = विनिर्यतमिन्द्राशायाः । But this correction involves "छन्दभङ्ग" ।

106a मूले खगतं 106b मूले दूरात् and पापात् ।

107 मूले तत्रास्थिति । U. R. has corrected it as "तत्रस्थिति" ।

108 मूले एका रेखा ।

108a मूले परम

109 मूले एका रेखा । मूले खगतं

110 The letter "से" is written above by U. R., after covering with ink a letter
which might be "छ" ।

111 मूले एका रेखा ।

अरविन्दलोचनः । [पुनः प्रहसन्निव नेपथ्याभिमुखमवलोक्य] अये निसर्गसुन्दर कमनीय-
दृष्टे पुरुषवर [इति सम्बोध्य स्वाशयः]* । न जानासि¹¹² श्रीभागीरथीमहिमानम् । यतः ।

येन भागीरथी-गङ्गाऽनीता दृक्पथ^{112a} सकृत् ।

स नरः किं स जातः किं [स]¹¹³जीवन् किं हत[प्रियः]¹¹³॥¹¹⁴

अपिच ।

धर्मार्थकाममोक्षाणां गङ्गा दात्री कलौ युगे ।

पीयूषमेव पानीयं धत्ते या पापहारिणी¹¹⁵ ॥

निसर्गसुन्दरः । [पुनः] कचिदरविन्द[लोच]नायुष्मन्¹¹⁶ [इति सम्बोध्य स्वाशयः]* ।
किं सर्वत्र गङ्गा समानोत्¹¹⁷ क्वचित् [इति] ।

पुनररविन्दलोचनः । निसर्गसुन्दर पूर्वजनु¹¹⁸ संसेवितभागीरथीक त्वं जानासि प्रश्नोत्तरं
तथापि शृणु । सर्वत्र गङ्गायाः प्रशस्तत्वेऽपि यत्र कालिन्दीमिलिता यत्र च उदधिमिलिता
सा प्रशस्ततमा । युक्तं चैतत् । तथाहि ।

प्रशस्तस्य प्रशस्तेन प्रशस्ततमता भवेत् ।

मणोः स्वर्णेन सम्पर्के यथा लोके तथा ध्रुवम्¹¹⁹ ॥

निसर्गसुन्दरः । [पुनः पुनः] अरविन्दलोचन सारासारविवेचनचतुर [इति सम्बोध्य
स्वाशयः]* । पुनरपि किमुतकृष्टमलास्ति यदुद्दिश्य श्रीरामविरचितं तं स्वयशोराशिमिव
सेतुवन्धं विहाय भवता समागतम् ।

अरविन्दलोचनः । [पुनः] निसर्गसुन्दर श्रीमन् [इति सम्बोध्य स्वाभिलषितं] । श्रीमती
गौरीप्रियकर्पूरगौरस्य नित्यनिवासभूमिर्वाराणस्यत्र चकास्तितरां । सा यथा—

वाराणसी भाति पुरी पुरारेदेवस्य गौरीरमणस्य रम्या ।

लिखितसा या महनीयकीर्त्या विभूषिता साऽश्रितकामधेनुः ॥

न मुञ्चतः कदाप्येनां काशीं कलिविवाञ्जिताम् ।

मृडानीकमलाकान्तौ ह्यविमुक्तं ततो जगुः ॥

112 अत्र मूले एका रेखा ।

112a मूले गंगाननीतादृक्०

113 Portions within brackets have been added by U. R. He has covered with thick ink 3 letters which stood at the end of the verse before the final; and has therefore added स before जीवन् to preserve the metre.

114 & 115 मूले एका रेखा ।

116 “विन्दनाना” इति मूले । The last letter which seems to be “न” is covered with ink by U. R.; he has added on the left margin “लोच” after ०विन्द ।

117 “समाजुत” इति मूले ।

118 मूले एका रेखा ।

119 मूले एका रेखा ।

* मूले खगर्तं

निसर्गसुन्दरः [पुनः हरिहरसेवितां वाराणसीं पुरीमाकर्ण्य तथाभूतां ताम् असम्भावयन्निव]
अरविन्दलोचन मृषैव साधु साधु [इति सम्भाष्य पुनः पुनर्मस्तकमान्दोलयन् स्वमतं*] ।¹²⁰

सत्यं ते ब्रुवते सत्यं रामं ये शरणं गताः ।

इति यद्यपि मे बुद्धिः कदाचिदोषतोऽन्यथा ॥

अरविन्दलोचनः । [किञ्चिदन्तःखिद्यन्निव बहिः प्रसादमाविष्कुर्वन् स्वमतं*]¹²¹ । अये
निसर्गसुन्दर परमास्तिक चित्तदोषं हरिभजनेन सम्यक् व्युदस्य वाराणसीं हरिहरसेवितामेव
सम्यगवगच्छ¹²² नान्यथा ।¹²³ अपि चात्र वसतां सतां हरिहरप्रसादः स्फुट एव प्रतीयते
सद्भिः । तथाहि ।

सरस्वती यत्र जनेषु कीर्त्तिर्भुक्तिश्च मुक्तिश्च शिवप्रियेषु ।

सा क्षान्तिवासं कुरुते स्थितेषु शिवे प्रसन्ने सति दुर्लभम् किं ।¹²⁴

निसर्गसुन्दरः । [परमकारुणिकं हितोपदेशारमास्तिकवर्गमरविन्दलोचनं निरीक्ष्य हरिभजनं
जिज्ञासुः स्वमतं*] । कच्चिदरविन्दलोचन जिज्ञासवे विनीताय शरणं गताय श्रद्धालवे हरि-
भजनमुपदिश । यतः—

शुश्रूषवः सदाचार ह्युपदेशया गतस्पृहेः ।

उपकारफला बुद्धिः सतां सद्भिः समादृतैः ॥

पुनश्च यतः—

न धात्वाप्यन्यथा शक्यं कर्तुं शीलं सतां शुभम् ।

परदुःखविनाशार्थं जातिबद्धं हि तद्यतः ॥

अरविन्दलोचनः । [हरिगुणालोचनपूर्णमानसो हरिभजनमेव पुरुषार्थसाधनं मन्वानः
कृपाकटाक्षै¹²⁵ निसर्गसुन्दरमाप्याययन् स्वमतं*] । अये निसर्गसुन्दर परमपुरुषार्थमते तव
हरिभजनोपदेशप्रार्थनं मुख्यं सिध्यति¹²⁶ । तथाहि—

फलाभिसन्धिना हीनं गोविन्दभजनं कुरु ।

यदुच्चावचभूतेषु समं^{126a} गोविन्ददर्शनम् ॥¹²⁷

निसर्गसुन्दरः [पुनः] करोमि करोमि हरिभजनम् [इति महाराजिनियोगमिव गुरुनियोगमुररी-

120 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

121 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

122 अत्र मूले एका रेखा । U. R. has covered it with ink.

123 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

124 मूले एका रेखा ।

125 “कृपाकटाक्षौ” इति मूले ।

* मूले खगतं

126 “मुख्यमेव भूयात्” is the reading of U. R.

126a मूले सम

127 मूले एका रेखा ।

कुर्वन् स्वमतं*] । स्वामिन्नयेऽरविन्दलोचन केन साधनेन हरिभजनमिह सिध्यतीति^{127a}
तदुपदेशोऽवश्यकः¹²⁸ । तथाहि—

उपदेशं विना साध्यं साधनस्य न सिध्यति ।

अन्यथा तीर्थकाराणां साधनोक्किर्तृषा भवेत् ॥¹²⁹

[पुनः] अरविन्दलोचनः । साधनजिज्ञासो श्रीमन् [इति निसर्गसुन्दरं सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

सन्तः सर्वात्मना सेव्या गोविन्दगुणवत्सलाः ।

विष्णोर्वा विष्णुभक्तानां गुणान् गायन्ति ते यतः ॥

[पुनः] निसर्गसुन्दरः । श्रीमन्नाथे गुरो परमकृपालो अरविन्दलोचन सम्प्रति ते सन्तः
क सन्ति [इति स्वमतं*] ।

सन्निकृष्टे यथा रूपं चक्षुषा परिगृह्यते ।

प्रत्यासन्नास्तथा सन्तः संसेव्याः शिवमिच्छता ॥¹³⁰

[पुनः] अरविन्दलोचनः । भो निसर्गसुन्दर सुकृतिन्¹³¹ [सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] । अपेक्षिता
एवैते सन्तः सन्ति । दुर्लभा अपि पदार्थाः सुकृतिनामपेक्षासमकालमेव सुलभाः । तथाहि—

नारदस्य यथापेक्षासमकालं पुराऽभवत् ।

सेव्यस्य कृष्णदेवस्य पुरणभाजो हि¹³² दर्शनम् ॥

[पुनः] निसर्गसुन्दरः । श्रीमन्नाथे परमकृपालो प्राणप्रद [इत्यरविन्दलोचनं सम्बोध्य
स्वमतं*] ।

यथा जलात् पृथक्मतस्या^{132a} न जीवन्ति जलासवः¹³³ ।

अचिरेण तथा तात भविष्यामि सतो विना ॥

[पुनः] अरविन्दलोचनः । अथे निसर्गसुन्दर हरिभजनप्रिय एते सन्तः पुरश्चलुषा
गृह्यमाणाः सन्ति ।

[पुनः] निसर्गसुन्दरः । कश्चिदरविन्दलोचन किमर्थमलागताः¹³⁴ सन्ति सन्तः ।

अरविन्दलोचनः [पुनः] अङ्ग निसर्गसुन्दर न जानासि किं यत् वृन्दावत्यधीशस्य श्रीमतो
भोजराजस्य हरिभजनैकाग्रचेतसो¹³⁵ गुणान् श्रोतुं तदनु अन्यान्¹³⁶ श्रावयितुं सन्तः
सभायामिमे समागताः¹³⁷ सन्ति ।

127a मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

128 मूले 'तदुपदेशोऽवश्यवः' इति पाठः । 129 मूले एका रेखा ।

130 मूले एका रेखा । 131 मूले अत्र एका रेखा अस्ति ।

132 ० हि has been smudged with ink by U. R. "हि" मूले तेन, "सु" कृतम् ।

132a मूले पृथक्मतस्या ।

133 "जलाववः" इति मूले । changed by U. R. into "जलासवः" ।

* मूले स्वगतं

134 'सति' इति मूले । 135 'वेतसो' इति मूले ।

136 'अनन्यान्' इति मूले । 137 अत्र मूले एका रेखा अस्ति । मूले समागता

निसर्गसुन्दरः [पुनः] गुरो श्रीमन्नरविन्दलोचन [इति सम्बोध्य इममरविन्दलोचनं तदनु
तांश्च सतः सभ्यान् त्रिः प्रदक्षिणीकृत्य सानन्दं स्वमतं*] ।

कायेन वाचा मनसा च भूमन् गुरु' भवन्तं सुखदं कृपालुम् ।
सभ्यांश्च साधून् कथितांस्त्वयेमान् नमामि सानन्दमनन्यचित्तः ॥¹³⁸
संसारतापलयहारिणो ये भवादृशाः सन्ति न तत्र चित्तम् ।
मुखैकतानस्य हरेर्गुणान् यद् वदन्ति सन्तः सततं वृणां हि ॥¹⁴⁰

अरविन्दलोचनः । [पुनः] अये हचिरमते परमप्रियहरिदासजन [इति¹⁴⁰ निसर्गसुन्दरं
सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

नमामि सर्वान् हरिभक्तिचित्तान् युष्मान् कृपालून् परदुःखहन्तान् ।
सर्वार्थसंसिद्धिमतः^{140a} प्रसन्नान् मूर्धाऽवनि स्पर्शवतीं विधाय ॥¹⁴¹
सद्गुणैः प्रियं नास्ति ममाव किञ्चित् सत्यं वदाम्येव सतां प्रियोऽहम् ।
मन्तो हरेर्मूर्तिरनूत्तरूपा विष्णुस्वभावाः किल तीर्थरूपाः ॥¹⁴²

निसर्गसुन्दरः । [पुनः सभ्यान् हरिभजनैकाग्रचित्तान् पुनः पुनः प्रणमन् पुनः पुनः
स्तुवन्^{142a} पुनः पुनः प्रदक्षिणीकुर्वन्] अये अरविन्दलोचन मम सर्वोऽपि तीर्थवासः सफलो
व्रतः श्रीमत्प्रसादेन । तथाहि ।

सम्यक् फलन्तीह तपोसि नूनं सम्यक् फलन्तीह पराश्च विद्याः ।
सम्यक् फलन्तीह गुरोः प्रसादात् तीर्थेषु वासाः सकला¹⁴³ परस्य ॥¹⁴⁴

अरविन्दलोचनः । [पुनः] निसर्गसुन्दर तपस्विन् [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

कस्मिंस्तीर्थे¹⁴⁵ निवासस्ते तपोसि चरतो मुनेः ।
वेदाध्ययनमुख्यानि कृतज्ञानि¹⁴⁶ शुचिचेतसः ॥¹⁴⁷

निसर्गसुन्दरः । [पुनः] अये श्रीमत्परमकारुणिक अरविन्दलोचन [इति सम्बोध्य
सानन्दं स्वमतं*] ।

हरिद्वारे वसाम्यस्मि मुनीनामालये शुभे ।
गङ्गाया भूषिते पूते जनानन्दकरे सदा ॥¹⁴⁸

¹³⁸ मूलं एका रेखा । मूलं ०मनंतचित्तः ¹³⁹ मूलं एका रेखा ।

¹⁴⁰ 'हरिदास जनेति' इति मूलं ।

^{140a} मूलं ०सिद्धिवतः

¹⁴¹ मूलं एका रेखा ।

¹⁴² मूलं एका रेखा ।

^{142a} मूलं स्तवन्

¹⁴³ अत्र मूलं एका रेखा । U. R. has smudged it with ink. Prof. D. M. Bhattacharya suggests सफलाः for सकला ।

¹⁴⁴ मूलं एका रेखा ।

¹⁴⁵ '...स्तीर्थो' इति मूलं ।

¹⁴⁶ 'कृतज्ञानि' इति मूलं ।

¹⁴⁷ मूलं एका रेखा ।

* मूलं खगतं

¹⁴⁸ मूलं एका रेखा ।

अरविन्दलोचनः । [पुनः पुनर्हरिद्वारं भक्तिभावेन मनसा पुरः पुरः पश्यन्तिव] आयुष्मन् श्रीमन्निसर्गसुन्दर [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

निगद्यते हरिद्वारं गुणेन केन सत्तमाः^{148a} ।

तपश्चारिमुनिवातभूषितोत्तमभूमिकाम् ॥

निसर्गसुन्दरः । [पुनः सन्तुष्यन्] अये हरिप्रिय [इत्यरविन्दलोचनं सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

हरिरूपा यतो मुक्तिस्तद्वारं तदिहोच्यते ।

मुक्तिद्वारं हरिद्वारमिति ख्यातिमगात् पुरा ॥¹⁴⁹

अरविन्दलोचनः । [पुनः] सत्सङ्गरुचे निगमार्थज्ञनिषेवक [इति निसर्गसुन्दरं सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

कमप्यतिशयं ब्रूहि हरिद्वारस्य मानद ।

सर्वतीर्थविशिष्टस्य संसेव्यस्य सतां पुनः ॥¹⁵⁰

निसर्गसुन्दरः । [पुनः] श्रीमन्नेये अरविन्दलोचन [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

भूयते वेदघोषोऽत्र ऋषीणामपि मानुषैः ।

तीर्थलाभविशुद्धैर्यत् कलावपि द्विजोत्तमैः ॥¹⁵¹

अरविन्दलोचनः । [पुनः] कच्चिदङ्ग निसर्गसुन्दर [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

ऋषीणां मानुषैर्वेदगिरः कुलापि न श्रुताः ।

हरिद्वारे हि श्रूयन्ते त्वयोक्तं कथमादरात् ॥¹⁵²

निसर्गसुन्दरः । [पुनः] अये हरिचरणकमलपरिचरणारमिक [इति अरविन्दलोचनं सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

देवतातीर्थमन्त्राणामसम्भाव्या¹⁵³ न शक्तयः ।

न दृष्टां च श्रुतां तद्¹⁵⁴ यद् द्वारकायां हि दृश्यते ।

न दृष्टो ब्रह्मबोधोऽत्र^{154a} जन्मनैकेन कुलचित् ।

काश्यां तु जन्मनैकेन मृत्युकाले शिवाद्गुरोः ।

अरविन्दलोचनः । [पुनः] मतिमन्निसर्गसुन्दर [इत्याभाष्य¹⁵⁵ स्वमतं*] ।

सर्वात्कृष्टहरिद्वारं विहाय कथमागतः ।

मणिं विहाय मतिमानादत्ते न वराटकम् ।

148a मूले सत्तमा ।

149 मूले एका रेखा ।

150 मूले एका रेखा ।

151 मूले एका रेखा ।

152 मूले एका रेखा ।

153 U. R. has covered *anusvāra* with ink.

154 मूले “कृतां” । U. R. has covered *anusvāra* with ink. न दृष्टा च श्रुताऽस्म्यं यत् इति मूले

मूले बोधोऽत्र

155 मूले ‘मतिमान्’ इति । changed into मतिमन् by U. R.

*मूले स्वगतं ।

श्रीभसन्तापसन्तप्तो विहाय स्वर्धुनीजलम् ।

न कूपजलमादत्ते कृष्ण¹⁵⁶ कोपि तृषार्हितः ॥¹⁵⁷

निसर्गसुन्दरः । [पुनः] अये पविलकीर्त्ते अरविन्दलोचन [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमतः*] ।

एकदा नारदो नूनं तीर्थयात्राप्रसङ्गतः ।

हरिद्वारं समागत्य मामाह च वचस्त्विदम्¹⁵⁸ ॥¹⁵⁹

मया साद्धं त्वमागच्छ निसर्गसुन्दरो भवान् ।

गमिष्यामि हरिं द्रष्टुं मधुपुर्यामसंशयम् ॥¹⁶⁰

अरविन्दलोचनः । [पुनः] अये पूज्यतम [इति निसर्गसुन्दरं सम्बोध्य] धन्योऽयं^{160b} धन्योऽयम् [इति वदन् स्वमतः*] ।

मधुपुर्यां तदागत्य नारदो ब्रह्मनन्दनः ।

कृतवान् किं त्वया साद्धं वदस्व वदतांवर ॥¹⁶¹

निसर्गसुन्दरः । [पुनः] अयेऽरविन्दलोचन [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमतः*] ।

मधुरायां मया साद्धं प्रविश्य नारदः क्षणात् ।¹⁶²

प्रसन्नमानसश्चासीत् हरिं सम्पूज्य वीक्ष्य च ॥¹⁶³

विनीतं दर्शयित्वा मां हरिं याहि सतां सभाम् ।

यवास्तीति मुनिः प्राह ततः प्राप्तः^{163a} स्म सत्सभाम् ॥¹⁶⁴

अरविन्दलोचनः । [पुनः] अये¹⁶⁵ निसर्गसुन्दर¹⁶⁶ श्रीमन्नावां कृतार्थौ । यतः श्रीकृष्ण-चरणकमलसेवकस्य वृन्दावत्यधीशस्य भोजराजस्य अम्बरीषादेरिव सच्चरितं¹⁶⁷ श्रोतुं श्रावयितुं च समागतानां सभ्यानामावयोर्दर्शनं स्पर्शनं सम्भाषणं च वृत्तम् एतेभ्यः सद्भ्यो नमोऽस्तु^{167a} । आवाभ्यां पुष्करादितोर्थान्यवगाहनीयानि अत्र न स्थेयम् ॥ [इति तौ निष्क्रान्तौ] ॥

[ततः प्रविशति चारुचरितः कीर्त्तिवर्मा च] चारुचरित । [तावत्] अये¹⁶⁸ कीर्त्तिवर्मन्नभिवन्धाः सन्तः सभ्याः पुरोवर्त्तिन एते । यतः श्रीकृष्णचरणकमलपरिचरणचुम्बो^{168a}

156 मूले “स्तूष्ट” । changed into “कृष्ण” by U. R. 157 मूले एका रेखा ।

158 मूले “चेल्यनाविल” इति ; changed into “च वचस्त्विद” by U. R. (Original reading can also stand). 159 मूले एका रेखा ।

160 मूले एका रेखा ।

160b मूले धन्योयं

161 मूले एका रेखा ।

162 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

163 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

163a मूले प्राप्त

164 मूले एका रेखा ।

165 मूले “पुनरयो” ; changed into “पुनरये” by U. R.

166 मूले “सुन्दरः” । changed into “सुन्दर” by U. R.

167 “सच्चरितं” इति मूले । changed into “सच्चरितं” by U. R.

167a मूले सद्भ्यो नमस्तु

168 “स्तावले” इति मूले changed into “स्तावदये” by U. R.

168a मूले परिचरण चंचो ।

*मूले स्वगतं ।

वृन्दावत्यधीशस्य भोजराजस्य निर्व्याजं सच्चरितं शृण्वन्ति श्रावयन्ति प्रशंसन्ति च ।
श्रीकृष्ण-सेवकस्तु¹⁶⁹ श्रीकृष्णस्याप्यभिवन्द्य किं पुनरन्येषाम् ।

कीर्तिवर्मा । [तावत्] अये श्रीमन् चारुचरित [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] । वृन्दावत्यधी-
शस्य भोजस्य गुणास्त्वया वर्णनीयाः । यतः¹⁷⁰—

सतो गुणान् येन वदन्ति विज्ञाः^{170a} सतां प्रकामं किल पापवन्तः ।¹⁷¹

भवन्ति ते सत्कृतयोऽपि तावद्^{171a} गुणाधिधानेन सतो ह्यवज्ञा ॥¹⁷²

चारुचरितः । [पुनः] अये कीर्तिवर्मन् [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

गुणाः सर्वे न शक्यन्ते भोजराजस्य केनचित् ।

ज्ञातुं वक्तुं यथाकाशतारकाः क्षितिपांसवः ॥¹⁷³

कीर्तिवर्मा । [पुनः] अये मतिमन् [इति चारुचरितं सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

वर्णनीया गुणा राज्ञस्तया भोजस्य शक्तिः ।

कार्यं कार्यं यथाशक्ति यथाबुद्धोति निश्चयः^{173a} ॥¹⁷⁴

चारुचरितः । [पुनः] अये कीर्तिवर्मन् [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

अजितोऽपि^{174a} यथा शश्वत् सेवते मृगयां प्रभुः ।

राजा भोजः पटुत्वाय तनोर्युद्धप्रियोऽवनौ ॥¹⁷⁵

अपि च—¹⁷⁶

ग्लानिं संबोध्य जन्तूनां मृगादीनां दयावशः ।

मृगयायां प्रवृत्तोऽपि^{176a} नैव हन्ति वनालयान् ॥¹⁷⁷

कीर्तिवर्मा । [पुनः] अये श्रीमन् [इति चारुचरितं सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*]¹⁷⁸ ।

मृगयायां प्रवृत्तेन हन्तव्या हरिणादयः ।

सर्वथा राजपुत्रेण राज्ञो धर्मो हि स स्मृतः ॥

चारुचरित्रः¹⁷⁹ । [पुनः] अये कीर्तिवर्मन् [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*]

प्रायो हन्ति वनावासान् भोजो वृन्दावतीश्वरः ।

लक्ष्यावितथवाणोऽयं सन्नस्तानपि प्राणिनः ॥¹⁸⁰

कीर्तिवर्मा । [पुनः] चारुचरित [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*]¹⁸¹

भुञ्जते विषयान् सर्वान् राजानो ये वशीकृताः ।

सर्वदा धनलावण्यसम्पदस्ते सखादिभिः ॥

168b मूले प्रसन्ति * मूले खगतं

169 “कृष्णसेवकस्तु” इति मूले । U. R. has covered “स्तु” with ink. ।

170 मूले रेखा नास्ति । 170a मूले विज्ञा

171 मूले ‘पापवन्तः’ इति । 171a मूले ‘योपि तावत्

172 & 173 मूले एका रेखा । 173a मूले निश्चयः

174, 175 & 177 मूले एका रेखा । 176 & 178 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

174a मूले अजितोपि 176a मूले प्रवृत्तोपि

179 “चरिते” इति मूले । U. R. has changed it into “चरितः” ।

180 मूले एका रेखा । 181 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

अतो वृन्दावतीशोऽयं^{181a} भोजराजो निषेवते ।
माल्यचन्दनयोषिद्विजितं किं बन्धहेतुभिः¹⁸² ॥¹⁸³

चारुचरितः । [पुनः सानन्दं] कीर्तिवर्मन् [इति सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

माल्यचन्दनयोषिद्विर्न जितः कर्हिचित् कृती ।
भुङ्क्ते भोजस्तथाप्येतान् विषयान् सङ्गवज्जितः ॥¹⁸⁴
नात्र चित्रं पुराचीर्णधर्मैः शुद्धमना ह्ययम् ।
भोजराजो वरोवर्त्ति सर्वराज-विभूषणम् ॥

कीर्तिवर्मा । [पुनः सोत्साहं] । अये चारुचरित धर्मप्रिय वृन्दावत्यधीशस्य भोजराजस्य
धर्मं वर्णय । यतः—¹⁸⁵

सुखं भवति धर्मद्वैराज्यमपि¹⁸⁶ तथा प्रियम् ।
पुत्रमित्रधनाद्यर्थास्तथाऽनर्थपराहतिः¹⁸⁷ ॥
यः परेण कृतस्यापि धर्मस्य कुरुते सुधीः ।
वर्णनं धर्मभागी स्यात् स्वात्मकार्यविवर्जितः ॥

चारुचरितः¹⁸⁸ । [पुनः] अये श्रीमन् [इति कीर्तिवर्माणं सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

अन्वहं भगवत्पूजां करोति सत्वमानसः ।
बुधसन्दिग्धभागं भोजोयं नियतेन्द्रियः ॥¹⁸⁹
फलाय कुरुते नैव धर्मं कर्मापि^{189a} वैष्णवम् ।
विज्ञाय कुरुते विज्ञो¹⁹⁰ राज्ञां वृन्दावतीश्वरः ॥

कीर्तिवर्मा । [पुनः] अये श्रीमन् चारुचरित [इति सानन्दं सम्बोध्य स्वमतं*] ।

श्रोक्लृप्ताजन्मनानन्दं समवाप्य नभोवसौ ।
जातेन कुरुते भोजो महोत्सवमति श्रियाम्¹⁹¹ ॥
ये धर्मा मृन्ना प्रोक्ता¹⁹² राज्ञस्ते नयवर्त्मनः ।
वृन्दावतीशभोजेन क्रियन्ते हरिचेतसा¹⁹³ ॥

181a मूले वृन्दावतीशोयं

182 “वन्धकारिभिः” इति मूले ।

U. R. has changed it into बन्धहेतुभिः ।

183 & 184 मूले एका रेखा ।

184a मूले पुराचीर्णैः धर्मैः

185 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

186 मूले “राज्यन्त” (?) । U. R. has covered “न्त” (?) with ink and has corrected it into राज्यमपि ।

187 मूले एका रेखा ।

188 मूले “चारुचित्” इति ।

189 मूले एका रेखा ।

189a मूले कर्मपि

190 “विष्णो” इति मूले । U. R. has changed it into विज्ञो

191 मूले रेखा नास्ति ।

श्रियं

192 मूले “प्रोक्ता” इति । U. R. has corrected it into प्रोक्ता ।

194 मूले एका रेखा ।

* मूले खगतं

चारुचरितः । [पुनः] अये कीर्तिवर्मन्नावां भोजराजसच्चरितश्रवणेन कृतार्थौ स्वसदनं
यास्यावः^{194a} । इति तौ निष्क्रान्तौ ।

श्रीमच्चक्रधरव्यासप्रसस्युत्फुल्ललोचनः ।

वृन्दावतीशभोजोयं जीयात् सूरिजनात्मजः ॥

इति श्रीमन्नारायणसरस्वतीसम्पूज्यचरणकमलयुगल वेदान्तवागीशभट्टाचार्यकृतौ¹⁹⁵ धर्माध्यक्ष-
व्यासश्रीगोपालनन्दनव्यासश्रीचक्रधरालङ्कृतवृन्दावत्यधीश(सुरजननन्दनवृन्दावत्य-
धीशश्रीभोजराज-सच्चरितनाम्नि श्रीनाटके द्वितीयोऽङ्कः समाप्तो मन्यः) ।

^{194a} मूले यास्याव

¹⁹⁵ Dr. S. K. Mookerjee suggests वृत्त after ०युगल० and before ०वेदान्त०

NOTICE

The *Indian Historical Quarterly* closes its 17th year with the publication of this issue. Copies of the first issue of the eighteenth volume of the *Quarterly* will be sent to our subscribers in due course per V. P. P. unless we are instructed beforehand to act otherwise.

It has been our sad experience that some of our subscribers by not acting up to this instruction have caused us loss; for, the refusal of each V. P. packet means to us a loss of postage of about /7/- besides the copy of the *Quarterly*, which is returned by the Post Office in such a condition that we have to reject it altogether. We therefore repeat our request to those who do not wish to continue as subscribers to kindly write us a card to the effect before the 15th February, 1942.

In this connection we would like to draw the attention of our subscribers to the Inland Postal rules quoted below regarding the retaining of V. P. packets at the Post Office :

"If, however, you desire that the article may be retained in the Post Office for a further period exceeding three days but not exceeding ten days, you should submit a written application bearing postage stamps affixed thereto at the rate of two annas per day or part of a day."

Manager,

INDIAN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

NOTICE

On account of shortage of supply of paper, we have decided to reduce the number of pages from 150 to 100. We hope our readers will not mind this in view of the extraordinary circumstances now prevailing. Our future issues will therefore contain about 100 pages.

The Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. XXVII

March, 1946

No. 4

The Dramas ascribed to Bhāsa

From the dramatic fragments of Aśvaghōṣa it is not unreasonable to assume that between him and Kālidāsa, there intervened a period of cultivation of the dramatic art, which we find fully developed in the dramas of Kālidāsa and which is warranted by Kālidāsa's own reference to the works of Bhāsa, Soma and Kaviṣṭha. Of the dramatic works of the last two authors we know nothing; but a great deal of facts and fancies are now available about Bhāsa's dramas.

Before 1912 Bhāsa was known only by reputation, having been honoured by Kālidāsa and Bāṇa as a great predecessor and author of a number of plays, and praised and cited by a succession of writers in later times;¹ but since then, much discussion has centred round his name with the alleged discovery of his original dramas. Between 1912 and 1915, T. Ganapati Sastrī published from Trivandrum thirteen plays of varying size and merit, which bore no evidence of authorship, but which, on account of certain remarkable characteristics, he ascribed to the far-famed Bhāsa. All the plays appear to have been based upon legendary material, but some draw their theme from the Epic and Purāṇic sources. From the *Rāmāyaṇa*, we have the *Pratimā* and the *Abhiṣeka*; from the *Mahābhārata*, *Madhyama*, *Dūta-vākya*, *Dūta-ghaṭotkaca*, *Kaṇva-bhāra*, *Ūru-bhaṅga* and *Pañcarātra*; but the *Svapna-vāsavadatta*, *Pratiṣṭhā-yaugandharāyaṇa*, *Avi-māraka* and *Cāru-datta* have legendary or invented plots, while the *Bāla-carita* deals with the Purāṇic Kṛṣṇa legend.² The plays were hailed with enthusiasm as the long

1 S. Lévi, *Théâtre indien*, Paris 1890, i, p. 157f. and ii, pp. 31-32 gives a résumé of literary references to Bhāsa known up to that time; other references up to date are collected together in Appendix C to C. R. Devadhar's ed. of the plays, cited below.

2 The legend is, of course, also found in the *Harivaṃśa*. All the plays are now available in a handy form in *Bhāsa-nāṭaka-cakra* or *Plays ascribed to Bhāsa*,

lost works of Bhāsa, but the rather hasty approbation of a novelty soon died down in a whirlwind of prolonged controversy. A large number of scholars of eminence and authority whole-heartedly supported the attribution to Bhāsa,³ but the reasons adduced did not win entire and universal satisfaction.⁴ This led to a further and more detailed examination of the question, yielding some fruitful results, and new facts regarding the plays were also brought to light. Important arguments were advanced on both sides; but it is remarkable that there is not a single argument on either side which can be regarded as conclusive, or which may not be met with an equally plausible argument on the opposite side.⁵ The problem today is delicately balanced; but since emphasis may be laid on this or that point, according to personal predilection, scholars, with a few exception, appear to have taken up

published by C. R. Devadhar, Poona 1937, but it is better to consult the original Trivandrum editions, to which references are given below. Trs. into English in two volumes by W. C. Woolner and L. Sarup, Oxford University Press, 1930-31. There are also numerous editions of some of the individual plays, but it is not necessary to enumerate them here.

3 For a bibliographical note of publications on Bhāsa till 1921, see V. S. Sukthankar in *JBRAS.*, 1921-22, pp. 230-49. The following publications after 1921 are of interest; S. Lévi in *JA.*, 1923, p. 19f.; A. K. and K. R. Pisharoti in *BSOS.*, iii, p. 107f.; T. Ganapati Sastri in *JRAS.*, 1924, p. 668 and *BSOS.*, iii, p. 627; A. K. Pisharoti, Bhāsa's works (reprinted from the Malayālam Journal *Rasikaratna*), Trivandrum 1925; K. R. Pisharoti in *BSOS.*, iii, p. 639, in *IHQ.*, i, 1925, pp. 103f., 330f., and *JBRAS.*, 1925, p. 246f.; C. R. Devadhar in *ABORI.*, 1924-25, p. 55f.; Kunhan Raja in *Zeitschr. f. Ind. und Iran.*, ii, p. 247f., and *Journal of Orient. Research*, Madras 1927, p. 232f.; W. E. Clarke in *JAOS.*, xlv, p. 101f.; F. W. Thomas in *JRAS.*, 1922, p. 79f., 1925, p. 100f., and 1927, p. 877f.; A. B. Keith in *BSOS.*, iii, p. 205f.; H. Weller in *Festgabe Hermann Jacobi*, Bonn 1926, pp. 114-125; M. Winternitz in *Woolner Commemoration Volume*, Lahore 1940, pp. 297-30; A. D. Pusalkar, *Bhāsa, a Study*, Lahore 1940; etc.

4 The first doubt appears to have been voiced independently by Ramavatar Sarma in *Śāradā*, i. Allahabad 1914-15 and L. D. Barnett in *JRAS.*, 1919, p. 233f. and in *BSOS.*, 1920, i, pp. 35-38, (also *JRAS.*, 1921, pp. 587-89, *BSOS.*, iii, pp. 35, 519, *JRAS.*, 1925, p. 99). Among dissenters are also Bhattanatha Svamin in *IA.*, xlv, 1916, pp. 189-95; K. R. Pisharoti in works cited above; and Hirananda Sastri in *Bhāsa and Authorship of the Trivandrum Plays* in *Memoirs of Arch. Surv. of India*, no. 28, Calcutta 1926; S. Kuppusami Sastri in introd. to *Śaktibhadra's Āścarya-cūdāmaṇi*, ed. Balamanojaram Press, Madras 1926.

5 An admirably judicious summary of the important arguments on both sides is given by V. S. Sukthankar in the bibliographical note cited above, and in *JBRAS.*, 1925, p. 126f.

unflinching attitudes and arrayed themselves in opposite camps. Between the two extremes lies the more sober view⁶ which recognises that a *prima facie* case for Bhāsa's authorship can be made out, but the evidence available does not amount to conclusive proof.

It will not be profitable to enter into the details of the controversy, but certain facts and arguments are to be taken into account before we can enter into a consideration of the plays. Since learned opinion is, not without reason, strangely divided, nothing is gained by dogmatic and sweeping assertions; and it should be frankly recognised that the problem is neither simple nor free from difficulties. The first difficulty is the absence of the name of the author, in the prologues and colophons, of all the thirteen plays. It has been argued that this would testify to the great antiquity of the plays; and it has been assumed, plausibly but without proof, that the colophons were not preserved or that such details were left out in pre-classical times. But, while nothing can be argued from our absolute lack of knowledge of pre-classical practice, the accidental and wholesale loss of the colophons of all manuscripts of all the thirteen plays by the same author is an assumption which demands too much from probability. On the other hand, the fact should be admitted at the outset that these plays are not forgeries, but form a part of the repertoire of a class of hereditary actors of Kerala (Cakkyars), that manuscripts of the plays are by no means rare, and that in omitting the name of the author, they resemble some of the plays of other classical authors similarly preserved by actors in Kerala. That they are not the absolutely original dramas of Bhāsa follows from this; and the assumption that they are adaptations, in which the adapters had obvious reasons to remain nameless, is at least not less plausible. The next argument regarding the technique of the plays is perhaps more legitimate; for there is undoubtedly a lack of conformity to the dramaturgic regulations of Bharata and his followers, which are more or less obeyed by the normal classical drama. But the argument is not as sound as it appears.—The technical peculiarities⁷ relate to the commencement of the Prologue by the Sūtradhāra, which is supposed to have been noticed by Bāṇabhaṭṭa, the use

6 Notably Sukthankar, cited above, and Winternitz in *Geschichte d. ind. Lit.*, iii, pp. 186f.; but later on Winternitz is reported to have expressed the opinion that he is no longer a believer in Bhāsa's authorship of the plays (C. R. Devadhar's Preface to the ed. cited above).

7 M. Lindenau, *Bhāsa-studien*, Leipzig 1918, pp. 10, 37.

of the word *Sthāpanā* for *Prastāvanā*, the introduction of stage-fights and death-scenes, the tragic ending in some plays, and the difference in the *Bharata-vākya*. It has been shewn in reply that while *Bāṇa's* reference is either obscure, misunderstood or entirely irrelevant,⁸ the formal features recur also in Malayālam manuscripts of quite a number of Sanskrit plays of other authors and are capable of other explanations equally plausible. In the absence of adequate knowledge of pre-classical technique, such peculiarities, as are not confined to the dramas in question alone, are hardly of decisive value; at most we can infer the interesting existence of a different dramatic tradition, but this does not prove the antiquity of the Trivandrum plays.

It has been also argued by the supporters of the attribution that expressions and ideas from these plays have been borrowed or exploited by authors like *Kālidāsa* and *Bhavabhūti*. While no strict proof or criterion of indebtedness is possible, it can be equally well argued, on the contrary, that the author or adapter of these anonymous plays plagiarised the alleged passages from standard Sanskrit authors. The citations, again, from *Bhāsa* or criticisms in the rhetorical or anthological literature,⁹ relied upon by the supporters of the theory, have some plausibility, but they do not prove much; for these authors do not, unfortunately, name the plays from which

8 It is pointed out that *Bāṇa's* reference (too brief to be decisive) merely speaks of the *Bhāsa*-dramas being commenced by the *Sūtradhāra*, a characteristic, which being true of all Sanskrit plays, has no special application here. The formula *nāndyante*, found in the Southern manuscripts *before* and *not after* the *Nāndi-śloka* is now known to be a characteristic of most South Indian manuscripts of Sanskrit plays in general, and was, thus, apparently a local practice, which is neither material nor relevant to the discussion. It is also not clear if *Bāṇa* is really alluding to such technical innovations as the shortening of the preliminaries, or the combining of the functions of the *Sūtradhāra* and the *Sthāpaka*. The rhetorical works are neither unanimous nor perfectly clear regarding the position of the *nāndyante* formula or the use of the word *Sthāpanā*. With regard to the employment of the *Bharata-vākya*, again, the Trivandrum plays do not follow a uniform practice which would support any definite conclusion regarding them. There is no such conspicuous *Patākā* in the plays as required by *Bāṇa's* pointed description.

9 The thirteen anthology verses ascribed to *Bhāsa* (one of which occurs in the *Matta-vilāsa* and four are attributed to other authors) are missing in the Trivandrum plays. Even if this is suspicious, it proves nothing because of the notoriously uncertain and fluctuating character of anthological attributions. See F. W. Thomas in *IRAS.*, 1927, p. 883f.

the passages are taken. It is true that one of the famous dramas of Bhāsa is cited and styled *Svapna-vāsavadatta* by some old authors;¹⁰ but here again the difficulty is that our present text of the Trivandrum *Svapna-nāṭaka* does not contain some verses quoted by certain rhetoricians¹¹. The difficulty is indeed not insuperable, inasmuch as one can imagine that they are misquotations, or that they are lost in the present recension; but the wholly conjectural character of such an explanation is obvious. The discussion regarding references in the plays to Medhātithi's *Bhāṣya* on Manu¹² or to the *Artha-śāstra*¹³ has not also proved very fruitful. And the least valid of all appears to be the Prakrit argument¹⁴ which presumes that archaisms in the Prakrit of the plays prove their earliness; for it is now clear that some of them are obvious blunders, and that, of those which are genuine, archaisms of a similar type recur in the Malayālam manuscripts¹⁵ of the plays of other authors, including those of Kālidāsa and Harṣa; they are apparently local developments and cannot be made the safe basis of any chronological or literary conclusion.¹⁶ The historical discussion, again, regarding the identity of Bhāsa's patron, alleged to be mentioned in the word *rājasimha* of the *Bharata-vākya*, is similarly shown to be of very doubtful value.¹⁷

10 The argument regarding the impossibility of the plagiarism of the title does not, as Barnett points out, carry much weight; since we know of three *Kumāra-sambhavas*.

11 Sukthankar in *JBRAS.*, 1925, p. 135f., shows that the reference of Rāmācandra and Guṇacandra in their *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* contains a situation and a stanza, quoted from a *Svapna-vāsava*° of Bhāsa, which really belongs, with some textual difference, to the Trivandrum play. F. W. Thomas in *JRAS.*, 1928, p. 885f., similarly deals with Abhinavagupta's citation missing in the Trivandrum play. Cf. also F. W. Thomas in *JRAS.*, 1922, p. 100f.

12 Barnett in *BSOS.*, iii, pp. 35, 520-21; Keith in *BSOS.*, iii, p. 623f.; Sukthankar in *JBRAS.*, 1925, pp. 131-32.

13 See Hirananda Sastri, *op. cit.*, p. 13f.

14 W. Printz, *Bhāsa's Prakrit*, Frankfurt 1921, Keith in *BSOS.*, iii, p. 296; V. Lesny in *ZDMG.*, lxxii, 1918, p. 203f.; Sukthankar in *JAOS.*, xl, 1920, pp. 248-59, and *JBRAS.*, 1925, pp. 103-117.

15 Pisharoti in *BSOS.*, iii, p. 109.

16 Sukthankar in *JBRAS.*, 1925, p. 103f. Even where the archaisms are genuine, it is, as R. L. Turner points out (*JRAS.*, 1925, p. 175), dangerous to argue about date without full appreciation of possible dialectical differences, because a form may not necessarily indicate difference of age but only a difference of dialect or locality.

17 Barnett conjectures that *Rājasimha* is a proper name and refers to Pāṇḍya

Leaving aside minor questions, these are, in brief, some of the important problems that arise out of the Trivandrum plays. It will be seen that the same material has led to absolutely contradictory results; but none of the arguments advanced in support of Bhāsa's authorship is incontrovertible or reasonably conclusive. Opinion, again, is sharply divided about the age of the plays,¹⁸ between those who place them in the 5th century B.C. and those who bring them down by different stages to the 11th century A.D., the estimate varying by about sixteen centuries! It is no wonder, therefore, that the whole question has run the normal course of enthusiastic acceptance, sceptical opposition and subdued suggestion of a *via media*. But beneath all diversity of opinion lurks the fundamental divergence about the literary merits of the plays, the supporters claiming high distinction, worthy of a master-mind, and the dissenters holding that the works are of a mediocre or even poor quality. As the question of literary excellence is not capable of exact determination, the difference of opinion is likely to continue according to the personal bias of the particular critic, until some objective factor or material would supply a conclusive solution to the problem. But it should be made clear that the whole discussion has now come to a point where the plays need no longer be made the fertile ground of romantic speculations. Already different aspects of the plays have been searchingly investigated;¹⁹ and even if no definite solution is yet logically justified by the results of these intensive studies, they have helped to clear up misconceptions, negative baseless presumptions, and bring together a mass of material for further research.

Tēr-Māran Rājasimha I (c. 675 A.D.). Sten Konow, *Ind Drama*, p. 51, would assign the author of the plays to the reign of Kṣātrapa Rudrasimha I, i.e. 2nd century A.D., but the arguments are not conclusive.

18 See Sukthankar, *IBRAS.*, 1922, p. 233 for different estimates of the date by different scholars.

19 E.g., on the Prakrits of the plays, by Printz, Sukthankar and others as noted above; on lexicographical and grammatical peculiarities, by C. J. Ogden in *JAOS.*, xxxv, 1915, pp. 269f. (a list of solecisms are given in App. B in Devadhara's ed.); on metrical questions, by V. S. Sukthankar in *JAOS.*, xli, 1921, pp. 107-130; on the sources of the Udayana legend, by F. Lacôte in *JA.*, xiii, 1919, pp. 493-525 and P. D. Gune in *ABORI.*, i, 1920-21, pp. 1-21; on a concordance of parallel and recurrent passages, by Sukthankar in *ABORI.*, iv, 1923, p. 170f.; on the relationship between the *Cārudatta* and the *Mṛcchakatika*, by Morgenstierne, *Ueber das Verhältnis zwischen Cārudatta und Mṛcchakatika*, Leipzig 1921, S. K.

These studies have now made it reasonable to assume that the Trivandrum plays, whether they are by Bhāsa or by some other playwright, are of the nature of adaptations or abridgments made for the stage, and they have in fact been regularly used as stage-plays in the Kerala country. This very important fact should not be lost sight of in any discussion of the plays. It explains the traditional handing down of the plays without mention of the author's name, in closely resembling prologues, which are probably stage-additions, as well as the coincidence of formal technique and a large number of repetitions and parallels, which recur in these, as also in some other Sanskrit plays of Kerala.²⁰ Some unquestionably old Prakrit forms and genuine grammatical solecisms may have in this way been fossilised and preserved, although they do not necessarily prove the antiquity or authorship of the plays. The thirteen Trivandrum plays reveal undoubted similarities, not only verbal and structural, but also stylistic and ideological, which might suggest unity of authorship, a theory indicated by the reference of Bāṇa and others to a Bhāsa-Nāṭaka-cakra; but since these are adaptations, and the originals are not known, it would be unsafe to postulate common authorship on similarities which occur also in plays of other known authors preserved in Kerala.

A modified form of the theory makes an exception in favour of a limited number of the dramas, the merits of which have received wide recognition. It suggests that possibly Bhāsa wrote a *Svapna-vāsavadatta*²¹ and a *Pratiñā-yaugandharāyaṇa*, closely related to it, of which the present texts give Malayālam recensions; and that the present *Cārudatta* is the fragmentary original of the first four acts of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* of Sūdraka, or, at any rate, it has preserved a great deal of the original upon which Sūdraka's drama is based.²² But the authorship of the remaining plays is as yet quite uncertain. It must be said that the reasons adduced for these views undoubt-

Belvalkar in *Proc. of the First Orient. Conf.*, 1922, p. 189f., and Sukthankar in *JAOS.*, xlii, 1922, pp. 59-74, and J. Charpentier in *JRAS.*, 1923, p. 599f., etc.

²⁰ Some of these are collected together in Hirananda Sastri, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-16,

²¹ Sukthankar, in *JBRAS.*, 1925, p. 134f. and Thomas, in *JRAS.*, 1928, p. 876f. believe that the Trivandrum *Svapna*° has probable minor changes, but has not undergone any great transformation.

²² Morgenstierne, Sukthankar and Belvalkar, as cited above. The *Cārudatta* is undoubtedly a fragment, but from internal evidence it is probable that the author or the compiler never contemplated writing only four acts. It is, however, not explained why this work alone is recovered as a fragment.

edly make out a strong case; but they are still in a great measure conjectural, and do not lead to any finality. It is possible also that the five one-act Mahābhārata pieces form a closely allied group, as the surviving intermediate acts of a lengthy dramatised version of the Mahābhārata story; but here also we have no definite means of ascertaining it for a fact.

In view of these difficulties and uncertainties, it is clear that it behoves the sober student to adopt an attitude free from susceptibility to any hasty or dogmatic conclusion. The objective criterion proving insufficient, the ultimate question really comes to an estimate of the literary merits of the plays; but on a point like this, opinion is bound to be honestly divergent and naturally illusive. The circumstance that all these plays, even including the limited number which may be, with some reason, ascribed to Bhāsa, are Malayālam adaptations or recensions of the original, causes a further difficulty; for the plays are in a sense by Bhāsa, but in a sense they are not. The fact of their being recasts does not, of course, make them forfeit their connection with the original, but the extent to which the older material has been worked over or worked up by a later hand is unknown and uncertain. The suggestions that have been made about distinguishing the apparently older from the more modern matter and manner are more or less arbitrary; for, in spite of unquestionably primitive traits, the process involves the difficulty of distinguishing the true Bhāsa from the pseudo-Bhāsa, not merely play by play, but scene by scene, and even verse by verse. It must also be admitted that all the plays are not, by whatever standard they are judged, of equal merit, and cannot be taken as revealing the alleged master-mind. One must feel that some of the scenes are very inferior and some of the verses are of feeble workmanship. At the same time, it can hardly be denied that here we have a series of plays, which are of varying merit but not at all devoid of interest; that in part or in entirety they may not belong to Bhāsa, but they certainly represent a somewhat different tradition of dramatic practice; and that if they are not as old as some critics think they are of undoubted importance in the literary history of the Sanskrit drama.

Leaving aside the fragmentary *Cārudatta* in four acts,²³ the two dramas which have won almost universal approbation are the *Śvapna-vāsavadatta*

23 Ed. T. Ganapati Sastri, Trivandrum Sansk. Scr., 1914, 1922; the text, along with correspondences to Sūdraka's *Mṛcchakatika*, is reprinted by Morgenstierne,

and the *Pratijñā-yaugandharāyaṇa*; and, in spite of obvious deficiencies, the approbation is not unjust. Both these works are linked together by external similarities and internal correspondences, and their theme is drawn from the same legend-cycle of Udayana,²¹ the semi-historical beau ideal of Sanskrit literature, whose story must have been so popularised by the *Brhatkathā* that Kālidāsa assures us of its great popularity in his time at Avantī. The story of Udayana's two pretty amourettes supply the romantic plot to Harṣa's two elegant plays; but what we have here is not the banality of an amusing court-intrigue. In the *Pratijñā*^o, Udayana and Vāsavadattā do not make their appearance at all, but we are told a great deal about them, especially about Udayana's accomplishments, his courage, his love and his impetuous acts. It is really a drama of political intrigue, in which the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa, as the title indicates, is the central figure but it achieves a more diversified interest than the *Mudrā-rākṣasa* by inter-weaving the well known romance of Udayana's love and adventure into the plot. Although the whole drama is characterised by simplicity and rapidity of action, it cannot be said that the plot is clearly and carefully developed. The ruse of the artificial elephant appears to have been criticised by Bhāmaha (iv. 40) as incredible, especially as Udayana is described as well versed in the elephant-lore, but it is a device which is not unusual in the popular tale and need not be urged as a serious defect. It is, however, not made clear at what stage the incident of the music lesson, alluded to in iv. 18, actually took place,²⁵ nor why the captive king, at first treated with honour and

op. cit. The fragment has no Nāndi verse, and abruptly ends with the heroine's resolve to start out for Cārudatta's house. The dramatic incidents do not show any material divergence of a literary significance from Śūdraka's drama—The plays are published in the following order by T. Ganapati Sastri from Trivandrum: *Swapna* (also 1915, 1916, 1923, 1924), *Pratijñā* (also 1920), *Avi-māraka*, *Pañcarātra* (also 1917), *Bāla-carita*, *Madhyama* (also 1917), *Dūta-vākya* (also 1918, 1925), *Dūta-gḥaṭotkaca*, *Karṇa-bhāra* and *Ūru-bhaṅga*—all in 1912, the last five in one volume, the others separately; *Abhiśeka* 1913, and *Pratimā* 1915 (also 1924).

24 On the legend of Udayana, see Lacôte, cited above, and A. V. W. Jackson's *Introd.* to *Priyadarśikā*, p. lxiii f. and references cited therein.

25 It could not have come between acts ii and iii, for the jester and the minister know nothing of it; and Udayana's famous lute is sent by Pradyota to Vāsavadattā in act ii, while Udayana lies wounded in the middle palace. In act iii we are told that Udayana, now in prison, somehow recovers his lute and catches sight of Vāsavadattā as she goes in an open palanquin to worship at a shrine opposite the prison-gate. Nor is the music lesson made the occasion of the first meeting between acts

sympathy, was thrown into prison so that "his fetters clank as he bows before the gods". Nevertheless, the drama finely depicts the sentiment of fidelity of a minister who is prepared, even by sacrifice of himself, to bring about a successful royal alliance. Some of the episodes, especially the domestic scene at the palace of Mahāsena Pradyota and the amusing interlude of the intoxicated page, are skilfully drawn; the characterisation, especially of Yaugandharāyaṇa, is vivid and effective; and the sustained erotic sub-plot, despite the non-appearance of the principal characters, enhances its main interest of political strategy.

The *Svapna-vāsavadattā*, on the other hand, is less open to criticism. It is more effectively devised in plot,²⁶ and there is a unity of purpose and inevitableness of effect. The general story belongs to the old legend; but the motif of the dream is finely conceived, the characters of the two heroines are skilfully discriminated, and the gay old amourist of the legend and of Harṣa's dramas is figured as a more serious, faithful, if somewhat love-sick and imaginative, hero. The main feature of the play, however, is the dramatic skill and delicacy with which are depicted the feelings of Vāsavadattā, to whose noble and steadfast love no sacrifice is too great; while her willing martyrdom is set off by the equally true, but helpless, love of Udayana as a victim of divided affections and motives of statecraft. It is a drama of fine sentiments; the movement is smooth, measured and dignified, and the treatment is free from the intrusion of melodrama, or of rant and rhetoric, to which such sentimental plays are often liable. If it is rough-hewn and unpolished, it also reveals the sureness of touch of a great dramatist; and to stint the word master-piece to it is absurd and ungenerous.

It must be frankly admitted, however, that these happy features are not possessed by the ten remaining Trivandrum plays, although each of them possesses some striking scenes or remarkable characteristics. Excepting the *Pañcarātra*, which extends to three acts, the Mahābhārata plays, whose

iii and iv; and yet no other version is given in the play. Lacôte is perhaps right in pointing out that the allusive way in which the theme is developed in these plays proves that it was already familiar to their audience, and the details which the dramatist casually introduces or omits are to be supplied from popular tradition. The hiatus, therefore, did not perhaps prove very serious or material to his audience.

²⁶ But there are some trifling inconsistencies and lack of inventive skill, e.g., the false report of Vāsavadattā's death is made the pivot of the plot, but the audience knows from the beginning that the queen is not really dead. One may, however, justify it by Coleridge's dictum of dramatic expectation, instead of dramatic surprise.

literary merit has been much exaggerated, consist of one act each, and form rather a collection of slight dramatic scenes than complete and finished dramas. But they are meant to be of a sterner stuff and make up by vigour what they lack in finish, although a lurking fondness is discernible for mock-heroic or violent situations. The *Madhyama* has a theme of the nature of a fairy tale, of which there is no hint in the Epic; but the motif of a father meeting and fighting his own son unawares is not original, nor is the idea of the 'middle one', though cleverly applied, unknown, in view of the Brāhmaṇa story of Śunaḥśeṣa (*Ait. Br.* vii. 15). What is original is the imagining of the situation of the epic tale, but the possibilities of the theme are hardly well developed within the narrow limits of one act. There is also in the Epic no such embassy of Bhīma's son as is dramatised in the *Dūta-ghaṭotkaca*, which describes the tragic death of Abhimanyu and the impending doom of the Kurus; there is some taunting and piquancy, but no action, and the whole scene is nothing more than a sketch. The *Dūta-vākya* is more directly based on the account of the embassy of Kṛṣṇa described in the Udyoga-parvan; but it suffers also from the same lack of action, and the theme is exceedingly compressed and hardly completed. While the introduction of the painted scroll of Draupadī is an ingenious invention to insult the envoy effectively, the appearance of Viṣṇu's weapons, though original, is silly in serving no useful dramatic purpose. In spite of its tragic note and simplification of the original story, the *Karṇa-bhāra*, which describes the sad end of Karṇa, is scarcely dramatic, and the only feature which appeals is the elevation of Karṇa's character; it is not only a one-act play but really a one-character play. The same sympathy for the fallen hero is seen in the *Ūru-bhaṅga*, which represents the theme of Duryodhana's tragic death somewhat differently from that of the Epic. The noble resignation of Duryodhana and the invention of the poignant passage, which brings the blind king and his consort on the scene and makes Duryodhana's little son attempt to climb on his father's broken thighs, reveal some dramatic power; but the introductory long description of the unseen fight is not happily conceived, and the play is also remarkable in having as many as sixty-six stanzas in one act alone! The *Pañcarātra*, in three acts, is longer in extent, and perhaps shows more invention and possesses greater interest. It selects, from the Virāṭa-parvan, the dramatic situation of the Pāṇḍavas in hiding being forced into battle with the Kurus; but it simplifies the epic story, the details of which are freely handled.

While Trigarta's attack is omitted, Duryodhana's sacrifice, the motif of his rash promise, and Abhimanyu's presence on the Kaurava side and capture by Bhīma are invented; and Duryodhana and Karṇa are represented in more favourable light, Śakuni being the only villain in the piece. The number of characters is large in proportion to its length. The play is ingeniously titled, and there are some striking dramatic scenes; but regarded as a story, it is far inferior to that of the Epic, and there is no substance in the suggestion that it is closer to the epic feeling and characterisation. The epic plays are, no doubt, of a heroic character, but they are far removed from the heroic age; their novelty wins a more indulgent verdict than is perhaps justified by their real merit.

The Rāmāyaṇa plays are more ambitious and much larger in extent. The *Pratimā* seeks, in seven acts, to dramatise, with considerable omission and alteration, the almost entire Rāmāyaṇa story, but its interest centres chiefly round the character of Bharata and Kaikeyī. Kaikeyī is conceived as *une femme comprise*, a voluntary victim of public calumny, to which she patiently submits for the sake of her husband's honour and the life of her dear step-son; and here again we find the same sympathy for the martyr and the persecuted. The development of the plot is skilfully made to depend on the secrecy of Kaikeyī's noble motive for the seemingly greedy conduct of demanding the throne for her own son; but for this, the plea of a *śulka* (dowry) promised to her by Daśaratha has to be substituted for the two boons of the original, and the explanation of her motive itself at the end is rather far-fetched. The scene of the Statue Hall is connected with the same motif and creates a situation; but it is hardly worked out as its keynote, as the title would suggest. The liberty taken in modifying the scene of Sītā's abduction, no doubt, substitutes a noble motive for the vulgar one of the greed for a golden deer; but it fails to be impressive by making Rāma childishly gullible person and Rāvaṇa a rather common, boastful villain. One of the striking scenes of the drama is that of Daśaratha's sorrow and death, which reveals a delicate handling of the pathos of the situation; but, on the whole, the merits and defects of this drama appear to be evenly balanced. The *Abhiṣeka*, on the other hand, takes up the Rāmāyaṇa story at the point of the slaying of Vālin and consecration of Sugrīva, and supplies, in six acts, the episodes omitted in the other play, ending with the ordeal of Sītā and the consecration of Rāma. The play is perhaps so named because it begins and ends with a consecration. But there

is not much dramatic unity of purpose behind the devious range of epic incidents. Its main feature is the sympathetic characterisation of Vālin and Rāvaṇa, but the other figures are of much less interest. Rāma is directly identified with Viṣṇu; but he is here, more or less, a ruthless warrior, of whose treacherous slaying of Vālin no convincing explanation is offered. In crossing the ocean, the miracle of divided water is repeated from the episode of Vasudeva's crossing the Yamunā in the *Bāla-carita*. Even if the *Abhiseka* is not a dreary summary of the corresponding parts of the Epic, it contains a series of situations, rather than a sequence of naturally developed incidents, and is distinctly feebler in dramatic character and quality than the *Pratimā*.

The *Bāla-carita*, in five acts, is similarly based upon a number of loosely joined incidents from the early life of Kṛṣṇa, but there are some features which are not found in the epic and purāṇic legends.²⁷ If they are inventions, some of them (such as the great weight of the baby Kṛṣṇa, the gushing of water from the sands or the incursion of Garuḍa and Viṣṇu's weapons) are clumsy and serve no dramatic purpose, while the introduction of Caṇḍālā maidens and of Kārttyāyanī, though bizarre, are scarcely impressive. The erotic episodes of Kṛṣṇa's career are missing, and the softer feeling is not much in evidence. There is a great deal of killing in most of the epic dramas mentioned above, but the *Bāla-carita* perhaps surpasses them all in melodramatic violence and ferocity. There is the slaying of the bull-demon, of the baby-girl hurled on the stone, as well as of the two prize-fighters and Kaṁsa himself, rapidly slaughtered in two stanzas! Kaṁsa, however, is not an entirely wicked person, but, as a fallen hero, is represented with much sympathy. There is, however, not much unity or completeness of effect; the play is rather a dramatisation of a series of exciting incidents. As such, it is a drama of questionable merit; at least, it hardly deserves the high praise that has been showered on it with more zeal than reason.

The *Avi-māraka* depicts the love-adventure of a prince in disguise, whom a curse has turned, for the time being, into an outcast sheep-killer. It is interesting for its somewhat refreshing, if not original, plot, based probably on folk-tale,²⁸ of the love of an apparent plebeian for a princess. But

²⁷ On the Kṛṣṇa legend see Winternitz in *ZDMG*, lxxiv, 1920, pp. 125-37.

²⁸ The motif of recognition and of the magic ring conferring invisibility are clearly important elements of the plot, derived apparently from folk-tale.

from the outset it is clearly indicated that the handsome and accomplished youth must be other than what he seems; and the suspense is not skilfully maintained up to the unravelling of the plot at the end. As in the *Pratijñā*°, the Vidūṣaka here is lively and interesting, but a Brahmin companion to an apparent outcast is oddly fitted. The denouement of a happy marriage, with the introduction of the celestial busy-body, Nārada, is rather lame; and the drama is not free from a sentimental and melodramatic atmosphere, in which the hero seeks suicide twice and the heroine once. For diversion from excess of sentiment, there are amusing scenes, such as the dialogue of the hero with the nurse and the small episode of the jester and the maid; but there is enough of overstrained brooding and one long monologue in the course of the hero's sentimental burglary, in which the question is not merely of the number of lines, but one of vital connexion. There is, however, no justification for the claim that the *Avi-māraka* is a drama of love, primitive in its expression and intensity.

It will be seen that all these plays are more or less faulty, and are not as great as they are often represented to be. Judgment must ultimately pass in respect of the *Svapna*° and the *Pratijñā*°, which have the greater probability, at least from the literary point of view, of being attributed to Bhāsa. They also are not faultless; but what appeals most to a student of the Sanskrit drama in these, as well as in the other plays, is their rapidity of action, directness of characterisation, and simplicity of diction, which are points often neglected in the normal Sanskrit drama in favour of poetical excursions, sentimental excesses and rhetorical embellishments. The number of characters appearing never worries our author, but the stage is never overcrowded by the rich variety; and, while most of the major characters are painted with skill and delicacy, the minor ones are not, normally, neglected. There is considerable inventive power; and even if the constructive ability is not always praiseworthy, the swift and smooth progress of the plot is seldom hindered by the profusion of descriptive and emotional stanzas, and monostichs are freely employed. There is no lack of craftsmanship in transforming a legend or an epic tale into a drama, and daring modifications are introduced, although it may be admitted that the craftsmanship is not always admirable, nor the modifications always well judged. The style and diction are clear and forcible, but not uncouth or inelegant; they have little of the succulence and 'slickness' of the ornate Kāvya. Even a casual reader will not fail to notice that the dramas do not possess elaborate art

and polish of the standard type; but that there is, without apparent effort, vigour and liveliness of a rare kind. They defy conventional rules, and even conventional expression, but are seldom lacking in dramatic moments and situations. Perhaps a less enthusiastic judgment would find that most of the plays are of a somewhat prosaic cast, and miss in them the fusing and lifting power of a poetic imagination; but it would be unjust to deny that they possess movement, energy and vividness of action, and considerable skill of consistent characterisation. There is nothing primitive in their art, on the one hand, and nothing of dazzling excellence, on the other; but there is an unadorned distinction and dignity, as well as an assurance of vitality. Even after deductions are made from exaggerated estimates, much remains to the credit of the author or authors of the plays. Whether all the aberrations, weaknesses and peculiarities indicate an embryonic stage of art, or an altogether different dramatic tradition, or perhaps an individual trait, is not definitely known; nor is it certain that all or any one of these plays really belong to Bhāsa and to a period of comparative antiquity; nor again can we determine the extent and nature of the recast to which they were submitted; but what is still more important to consider is that here we have, at least in some of the fascinating plays like *Svapna*^o and *Pratijñā*^o, a dramatist or dramatists of real power, whose unlaboured, but not forceless, art makes a direct and vitally human appeal. The deficiencies are patent, and a critic with a tender conscience may feel inclined to justify them; but they need not diminish or obscure the equally patent merits. The dramas have wrestled with and conquered time; and even if we cannot historically fit them in, they have an unmistakable dramatic, if not poetic, quality, and this would make them deserve a place of their own in the history of the Sanskrit drama.

S. K. Dr.

Origins of the Rajput War (1679-81)

The Ranas of Mewar since their submission to the Mughals in 1615 enjoyed a position which was peculiar to them alone amongst all the Mughal feudatories. They had been imperial grandees since the day of Rana Karan Singh, but no Rana had ever visited Delhi, and the question of personally serving in the Mughal ranks never arose. This privileged position was not enjoyed by any other imperial mansabdar. To this was added the claim of the Sisodias to be the head of the Rajputs in India, because Mewar was the premier Rajput state in the whole of India. Yet another feather in their cap was the fact that theirs was the only Rajput family that had not given its daughter in marriage to the imperial family.

Rana Raj Singh came to the throne of Mewar in October 1652, on the death of Rana Jagat Singh. The early years of his reign were marred by the last sack of Chitor by Asad Ullah Khan in October 1654, who was sent by Shah Jahan. As a price of the Rana's fortifications of Chitor, the Rana had to forfeit his parganas of Pur, Mandal, Khairabad, Mandal Garh, Jahazpur, Sawar, Phulia, Banera, Hurara and Bednor.¹ But Rana Raj Singh was the last man to sit quiet and the illness of Shah Jahan in 1657, which was a signal for disorder and a civil war among his sons, presented him with his chance. He extracted huge sums of money from the neighbouring Rajput states, which were under the Mughals.² But the loss of his parganas still rankled in his heart. Ready to take advantage of his opportunities, the Rana secured all these districts back, along with some more, as a price of the help that he rendered to Aurangzeb in this Civil War. Not only that, his mansab was raised by victorious Aurangzeb to 6,000 horse and personal with 1,000 as *do asph* and *seh asph*.³

That was the beginning of his relations with Aurangzeb. But the Ranas were never too submissive and very often indulged in things that were not very palatable to the Mughal emperors. Rana Jagat Singh had tried to fortify Chitor. In 1647, while on a pilgrimage to Onkar Nath he had quarrelled with the Muslim Subedar of Malwa.⁴ Rana Raj Singh

1 *Vir Vinod*, 381.

2 *Raj Prasasti*, 42-45, *Vir Vinod*, 381.

3 *Vir Vinod*, 392-395.

4 *Ibid.*, 296.

himself had, in 1641,⁵ quarrelled with the imperial officers when on a pilgrimage to Soramji. Thus Rana Raj Singh inherited more than his share of the spirit of independence which had characterized the conduct of the Ranas of Mewar.

When Aurangzeb made the Hindu temples a special target of his wrath, Rana Raj Singh very courageously opened the portals of his protection to the victims of Aurangzeb's fury.

The temple of Govardhana at Brindaban was razed to the ground. Damodar Lal, the head of the priesthood, stole away the idols and fled for safety. Bundi, Kotah, Pushkar, Krishan Garh and Jodhpur, all refused him a haven, because none of them dared shelter a person persecuted by Aurangzeb. When he reached Mewar, Raj Singh readily extended his protection to him. The Sisodia Prince accorded a right royal welcome to the party when it arrived on his borders and housed the gods at Sihar, where a grand god-installation ceremony was performed in March 1672.⁶

Similarly the idols of the temple of Dwarkadhis were housed in Kankroli.⁷

Another cause of offence for the emperor—as the Rajput tradition has it—was Rana Raj Singh's marriage with Carumati or Cancal Kumari. In 1658 Raja Rup Singh Rathor of Krishan Garh died and his son Man Singh succeeded him. The rulers of Krishan Garh were imperial grandees. Raja Man Singh's sister Carumati was known for her beauty. Aurangzeb sought her hand, though it is not certain whether he sought her for himself or for some royal prince. To Man Singh this was a rare opportunity for cementing his relations with the emperor, but the girl was rather upset. She could not bring herself to entering a Muslim *harem*. She saw no one who was bold enough to flout the emperor, or ready to incur his wrath. She courageously wrote to Raj Singh, the head of the Rajputs, to come to her rescue. One fine morning in the year 1670, Rana Raj Singh made his appearance before the gates of Rup Nagar, the capital of Krishan Garh. Raja Man Singh was nominally made a prisoner and Carumati was married and carried away by the gallant Rana.⁸

Though the emperor was offended yet it seems that it was not too big an incident to mar the cordiality of relations between him and the Rana.

5 *Vir Vinod*, 298.

6 Local tradition. Cf. *Religious Policy of Mughal Emperors* by Sri Ram Sharma.

7 *Ibid.*

8 *Raj Vilas*, 106-118, and *Raj Prasasti*, VIII, 29-30.

A royal *firman*, a robe of honour and a jewelled dagger were sent to the Rana on the 30th of December, 1674.⁹

The death of Raja Jaswant Singh Rathor of Jodhpur created new issues in the Mughal-Rajput relations. On December 10, 1678, Maharaja Jaswant Singh died at Jamrud while commanding the Mughal outpost there.¹⁰ The Raja died childless. There was the grave question of his succession. Aurangzeb claimed to regulate the succession to the Rajput states by virtue of his position as the Imperial overlord.

The person who was the best claimant to the throne of Jodhpur at the time of Jaswant Singh's death was Indar Singh, Rao of Nagor. He belonged to the senior branch of the Rathors, because he was the son of Amar Singh, the elder (but disinherited) brother of Raja Jaswant Singh. Aurangzeb could have put him there.

But the emperor decided to convert the state of Jodhpur into an imperial sarkar. He left Delhi for Ajmer on January 9, 1679¹¹—within less than a month of the passing away of Raja Jaswant Singh, probably because he wanted by his own presence to overawe the opposition that he might have expected in Jodhpur. On January 13, 1679 he appointed Muzahar Khan as the Fojdar of Jodhpur, Khidmat Guzar Khan as the Qiladar, Shaikh Anwar as the Amin and Abdul Rahim as the Kotwal of Jodhpur.¹² Important imperial officers like Asad Khan the Wazir, Shaista Khan and Akbar—his own son—were ordered from their respective provinces to meet the emperor at Ajmer.¹³

Most of the Rathor chiefs were absent from Jodhpur as they had accompanied Raja Jaswant Singh in his *exile*. But those who were there, had started asserting themselves.

It was during his march to Ajmer that the emperor must have learnt of the pregnancy of two Ranis of Maharaja Jaswant Singh. But he took no

9 *Maasir-i-Alamgiri*, 138. 10 *Basatin-i-Salat*, 516, *Maasir-i-Alamgiri*, 176.

Professor Jadu Nath Sarkar seems to belittle the importance of Jaswant Singh's position by his remark that Jaswant Singh 'was never the viceroy of Afghanistan or even Governor of Kabul city, but merely *thanadar* of Jamrud.' (*Aurangzeb*, vol. III, 369 notes). It must be remembered, however, that like the *Mutsaddi* (Customs Officers) of Surat, the *thanadar* of Jamrud seems to have been an independent commander directly responsible to the emperor. It was a much prized job, as is clear from the fact that in 1681, Raja Jai Singh tried to get this post but failed. (*Jarpur Records*, III, 48ff.).

11 *Maasir*, 170.

12 *Ibid.*

13 *Ibid.*, 172.

notice of it. He went on his way and reached Ajmer on February 19, 1679. The very same day Hasan Quli Khan was asked by the emperor to lead a new military force to Jodhpur to quell the disturbances caused by Dhiraj Dhar in the Jodhpur area. Khan Jahan too was asked to accompany Hasan Quli.¹⁴ Then started the sacrilege of Jodhpur, the desecration of its temples and the occupation of the country, bringing general disorder in its wake.

On March 9, the emperor issued orders for the confiscation of the property of Maharaja Jaswant Singh. Inayat Khan was sent there with orders to look into the income of Jodhpur. But Sar Buland Khan informed the emperor that Khidmat Guzar Khan who had been appointed Qiladar of Jodhpur in January 1679, had written from Siwana—the most important fort in Jodhpur—that he had found nothing except a few rags in the fort. Thereupon the emperor asked Sayyid Abdullah to go and find what could be had by digging in the fort.¹⁵

Aurangzeb's decision to convert Jodhpur into an imperial domain had no parallel. And so naturally the emperor was very keen on securing the support for his action in Rajput quarters. Missions of good will from the Rajput states, especially Mewar, were solicited.

The Rana of Mewar was not very greatly interested in the question. There was not much love lost between the Rathors and the Sisodias. In fact throughout the Mughal rule they had remained inimical to each other. Very often the Rathor armies were a part of the forces sent against Chitor. So what interest could the Rana have in the affairs of Jodhpur? To him it mattered little whether Jodhpur was an imperial domain or a feudatory state. Moreover there was no legitimate successor to the throne of Jodhpur so far. Indar Singh's claims were very doubtful on account of the fact that Amar Singh—Indar Singh's father—had been disinherited by his father and Amar Singh himself had renounced all his claims to Jodhpur. When Aurangzeb asked for a promise from the Rana for not helping the Rathors, who were causing trouble in Jodhpur, the Rana assented. He sent a promise of support or at least of benevolent neutrality on his behalf through his son Jai Singh. The latter, however, did not join the emperor till the 1st of April 1679 when the emperor was just five miles from Delhi.¹⁶

The emperor was yet at Ajmer when on February 26, he learnt that the two pregnant Ranis of Jaswant Singh, Jado and Nardaki by name, had

¹⁴ *Maasir*, 172.

¹⁵ *Akhabarat*, dated 9-3-1679.

¹⁶ *Maasiri-l-Umara*, Hindi translation, vol. I, 98.

given birth to two sons. He had been requested by the Rajputs to nominate any one of those sons to the throne of Jodhpur.¹⁷ The birth of these rightful heirs upset the emperor's schemes. There were misgivings in his mind. Without any just cause for his misapprehensions—because neither the family of Jaswant Singh had yet reached Delhi nor had it given Aurangzeb any occasion for distrust—Aurangzeb wrote to Rana Raj Singh from Ajmer not to shelter the two sons of Raja Jaswant Singh Rathor.¹⁸

While the affairs of Jodhpur were in a melting pot, the Rana of Mewar was confronted with another serious problem. Aurangzeb reached Delhi on Sunday the 2nd of April. On that very day he reimposed the much hated Jaziya on the whole of the Mughal empire including the feudatory states.¹⁹

The Hindus petitioned the emperor to repeal it. So much so that the people lay down in the path of the emperor when he was on his way to perform his Friday prayers. But they were trampled by the imperial elephants and the emperor did not pay any heed to it.²⁰

The Jaziya in the days of the early Muslim rulers, even under Babur and Humayun, had been confined to the imperial domains only. It was not levied on the feudatory states. So this order was a step further and as such it naturally affected Rana Raj Singh as well. Rana Raj Singh had sent Kunwar Jai Singh when the rumours of the reimposition of the Jaziyas were not there. The Kunwar though at Delhi could take little initiative and then again he knew very little of the mind of his haughty father. And so it was that Kunwar Jai Singh did not protest against it.

But Rana Raj Singh would not accept this lying down and not to be deterred, he sent in a strongly worded letter to the emperor in which he protested against the reimposition of Jaziya.

He wrote:—

“All due praise be rendered to the glory of the All-Mighty, and the munificence of Your Majesty, which is conspicuous as the sun and the moon. Although I, your well-wisher, have (been) separated from your sublime presence, I am nevertheless zealous in the performance of every bounden act of obedience and loyalty. My ardent wishes and strenuous services are employed to promote the prosperity of the king's Nobles, Mirzas, Rajas, and

17 *Fatubat-i-Alamgiri*, 73b.

19 *Mirati-i-Ahmadi*, 313.

18 *Basatin-i-Salatin*, 517.

20 *Abul Fazl Mammi*, 525-26.

Rais of the province of Hindostan, and the chiefs of Iran, Turan, Rome and Shawn, the inhabitants of the seven climes, and all persons travelling by land and by water. This my inclination is notorious, nor can your royal wisdom entertain a doubt thereof. Reflecting therefore, on my former services, and your Majesty's condescension I presume to solicit the royal attention to some circumstances, in which the public as well as private welfare is greatly interested.

"I have been informed that enormous sums have been dissipated in the prosecution of the designs formed against me, your well-wisher; and that you have ordered a tribute to be levied to satisfy the exigencies of your exhausted treasury.

"May it please Your Majesty, Your royal ancestor Mohammad Jalal-ud-Din Akbar, whose throne is now in heaven, conducted the affairs of this empire in equity and firm security for the space of fifty-two years, preserving every tribe of men in ease and happiness, whether they were followers of Jesus or of Moses, of David or Mohammad; were they Brahmans, were they of the sect of Dharians, which denies the eternity of matter, or of that which ascribes the existence of the world to chance, they all equally enjoyed his countenance, and favour, in so much so that the people, in gratitude for the indiscriminate protection he afforded them, distinguished him by the appellation of 'Jagat-Guru' (Guardian of mankind).

"His Majesty Mohammad Nur-ud-Din Jahangir, likewise whose dwelling is now in paradise, extended for a period of twenty-two years, the shadow of his protection over the heads of his people; successful by a constant fidelity to his allies and vigorous exertions of his arm in business.

"Nor less did the illustrious Shah Jahan, by a propitious reign of thirty-two years, acquire to himself immortal reputation, the glorious reward of clemency and virtue.

"Such were the benevolent inclinations of your ancestors. Whilst they pursued these great and generous principles, wheresoever they directed their steps, conquest and prosperity went before them; and then they reduced many countries and fortresses to their obedience. During Your Majesty's reign, many have been

alienated from the empire, and further loss of territory must necessarily follow, since devastation and rapine now universally prevail without restraint. Your subjects are trampled under foot, and every province of your empire is impoverished; depopulation spreads and difficulties accumulate. When indigence has reached the habitation of sovereign and his princes, what can be the condition of the nobles? As to the soldiery, they are in murmurs; the merchants complaining, the Mohammadans discontented, the Hindus destitute, and multitudes of people wretched even to the want of their nightly meal, are beating their heads throughout the day in rage and desperation.

"How can the dignity of the sovereign be preserved who employs his powers in exacting heavy tributes from a people thus miserably reduced? At this juncture it is told from east to west, that the emperor of Hindostan, jealous of the poor Hindu devotees will exact a tribute from Brahmuns, Sanohrahs, Jogis, Bairagis, Sanyasis, that regardless of the illustrious honour of his Timurin race, he condescends to exercise his power over the solitary, inoffensive and anchorite. If Your Majesty places any faith in those books, by distinction called divine, you will there be instructed that God is the God of all mankind, not the God of Mohammadans alone. The pagan, and the Musalmans are equal in his presence. Distinctions of colour are of His ordination. It is He who gives existence. In your temples to His name the voice is raised in prayer; in a house of images, where the bell is shaken still He is the object of adoration. To villify the religion or customs of other men is to set at nought the pleasure of the All Mighty. When we deface a picture, we naturally incur the resentment of the painter and justly has the poet said, "Presume not to argue or scrutinize the various works of the Power Divine."

"In fine, the tribute you demand from the Hindus is repugnant to justice. It is equally foreign from good policy, as it must impoverish the country. Moreover, it is an innovation and an infringement of the laws of Hindostan. But if zeal for your own religion hath induced you to determine upon this measure, the demand ought, by the rules of equity, to have been made first

upon Raja Ram Singh who is esteemed the principal amongst the Hindus. Then let your well-wisher be called upon, with whom you will have less difficulty to encounter, but to torment ants and flies is unworthy of an heroic or generous mind. It is wonderful that the ministers of your government, should have neglected to instruct Your Majesty in the rules of rectitude and honour.”²¹

The authorship of the letter is a much disputed question. In addition to the copy obtained from the Udaipur State Office, three more copies of the letter have been obtained. The ‘Royal Asiatic Society Manuscript No. 71, ascribes the authorship of this letter to Shivaji, while Asiatic Society, Bengal Manuscript No. 56, ascribes it to Sambhaji and Orme’s Fragment 252 ascribes it to Jaswant Singh.”²²

Now Sambhaji and Jaswant Singh are ruled out, because Sambhaji came to the throne late in 1680 when the Jaziya was over a year old and Jaswant Singh died about four months earlier to the levying of the Jaziya. So the main issue is between Shivaji and Rana Raj Singh.

The manuscript that reads Shivaji has got a few more sentences which are, “Though this well-wisher was led by his adverse fate to come away from your August presence without taking leave,” (alluding to his escape from Agra): “It can be right if only a beautiful woman wearing gold ornaments can pass from one country to another without fear of danger. (But) in these days even the cities are being plundered, what of the country.”²³

Then again instead of the sentence, “The demand ought to have been made first upon Raja Ram Singh who is esteemed the principal amongst the Hindus,” it has, “You ought to first levy the Jaziya from Raja Raj Singh who is the chief of the Hindus.”²⁴

The Asiatic Society, Bengal manuscript which ascribes it to Sambhaji also reads, “In the past Sultan Ahmad of Guzrat left the high way of truth, cast his soul into the jungles of such a foolish plan, and was extirpated and cut to pieces at Barudha. In the modern times (too) it is not becoming and noble to be involved in this.”²⁵ But the State copy that fell into the hands of Col. Todd does not give all these. It may be that these are the additions of the copyists.

21 Todd, 302-303.

22 ‘Letters of Shivaji’ by J. N. Sarkar, *Modern Review*, January 1908, 21.

23 *Ibid.*, 22.

24 *Ibid.*

25 *Ibid.*, 22 notes.

Now the very first sentence of the letter is sufficient to prove that Shivaji could not have written this letter at all, for he was never a well-wisher of Aurangzeb and he could never be. Though of course he did perform some services to the Mughals but those were very many years back. And since his flight from Agra in disguise their relations were very much constrained. He could never have described himself to be a servant and well-wisher of the Mughals at this time, while he was regularly levying Chauth and Sardeshmukhi on his neighbouring Mughal territories and had proclaimed himself an independent king. Moreover he was not to be affected by the Jaziya at all.

Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar has also ascribed this letter to Shivaji. He was perhaps led to think so, because the copy that fell into his hands gave that the letter was written by Nil Prabhakar Munshi, the official correspondent of Shivaji. But the copy that gives this fact may be wrong. The name of Nil Prabhakar Munshi may have been put down just as the name of Shivaji has been put down, perhaps in order to give authenticity to this letter.

Another fact that has led Professor Sarkar to this conclusion is that the copy mentions Rana Raj Singh as the head of the Hindus. This is of course a fact. But then not Rana Raj Singh but Raja Ram Singh was really the head of the Hindus at the Court.

While on the other hand if we put Rana Raj Singh in place of Shivaji, everything fits in. He was an imperial mansabdar and naturally therefore a well-wisher of the emperor. The services of his men had not been a forgotten story (viz. Bhim Singh's services to Emperor Shah Jahan and his own to Aurangzeb himself in the war of succession).

Then again Professor Sarkar describes it as a taunt on Shivaji's part, but there are more possibilities of its being a protest rather than a taunt.

This letter was too much for the emperor to swallow. But things were moving at a fast pace. The continuous trouble in Jodhpur was on the increase. One of Raja Jaswant Singh's sons, Ajit Singh—the other having died within a few weeks of his birth—was another source of trouble to Aurangzeb, while it served as quite a nice excuse for the Rathors for their rebellious behaviour. So Aurangzeb tried to retrace his steps. On May 26, 1679 he appointed Indar Singh as the Raja of Jodhpur.* Indar Singh presented Aurangzeb with a sum of Rs. 36,00,000.²⁶ Not content with that Aurang-

zeb even went to the extent of offering the throne of Jodhpur to Ajit Singh—Jaswant's living son—provided he turned a Muslim.²⁷ Presumably this offer must have been made when Ajit came to Delhi.

Maharaja Jaswant Singh's family reached Delhi towards the end of June 1679. The emperor was then informed of the death of one of Jaswant Singh's sons. The rights of the other were ably pleaded before the emperor. The imperial mansadar Hasan Quli Khan who argued the rights of the infant before the emperor was deprived of his mansab and jagir.²⁸

Ajit Singh was ordered to be brought up in the royal harem. This fact combined with the offer of the throne of Jodhpur on turning a Musalman was sufficient to put the custodians of Jaswant Singh's family on guard. The party which included Durga Das Rathor, Raghunath Das Bhatti, and Ranchor Joddhat,²⁹ got suspicious of the emperor's move. It was quite in keeping with their Rajput tradition when they vowed to die to a man, in the act of saving Ajit, the son of their late master. They tried to evade the imperial orders by arguing that the infant was too young to be separated from his mother. They were already under royal suspicion and this excuse of theirs was more than enough for Aurangzeb.

Aurangzeb demanded the surrender of Ajit. He had posted a strong guard at the house where the party was staying. On July 15, 1679 he reinforced this guard, and ordered a number of his officials such as Hamid Khan, Sayyid Khan, Fateh Khan Korwa, Kamal-ud-Din, Khwaja Mir, along with a large party of men to go, capture Ajit Singh and lodge him in prison in the fortress of Nurgarh.³⁰

By this time the Rathors had become desperate. They planned to effect Ajit Singh's escape by resorting to rear-guard action. The rear-guard of the party was to fight to death and check the progress of the pursuing party, while they were to carry away the family of the Raja as fast as they could.

The rest of the story as described by Iswardas reads more like the story of the Three Musketeers. Raghunath Bhatti, Ranchhor Joddhat, and the valiant Durga Das, each of them turned round one after the other, along with a handful of picked Rajput soldiers, to check the progress of the pursuing party. Then the night came to their rescue and the Mughals, too worn out by the action, returned home,³¹ baffled by a handful of Rajputs

27 *Bhim Sen*, 164-65.

29 *Ibid.*, 75b.

31 *Fatubat-i-Alamgiri*, 76a, b; *Basatin-i-Salatn*, 516; *Maasir*, 179.

28 *Fatubat-i-Alamgiri*, 75a.

30 *Maasir*, 178.

who had the courage of defying Aurangzeb and effecting the escape of Ajit Singh even from the streets of Delhi—the seat of the mighty empire.

The party safely reached Jodhpur on July 23.³² But the Mughal officials were not to be baffled.

They tried yet another weapon. Ajit Singh who had escaped was declared an impostor and termed as Ajit-a-jaali. Another babe of the same age was put up and delivered into the emperor's hands who named him as Muhammadi Raj and arranged for his education and bringing up in the royal harem. So sure was Aurangzeb that the true Ajit Singh was in his harem that "so long as the Rana of Chitor did not form a marriage connection with Ajit Singh the suspicion of his being a counterfeit did not leave the mind of Aurangzeb."³³

The emperor was very angry over the escape of the party to Jodhpur and was so much annoyed with the faujdar of Jodhpur, Tahir Khan that the poor man was degraded and dismissed, because he had not been able to keep out Durga Das. Aurangzeb also dethroned the two month old Raja Indar Singh who had failed to keep in check 50,000 Rathor blades.³⁴

Rana Raj Singh had already offended the emperor by his impertinent letter. More cause for displeasure was given when the Maharana gave refuge to Ajit Singh. Durga Das who was noted for his plausibility—the man who could lure Prince Akbar to revolt against Aurangzeb—was successful in persuading the Rana to give refuge to Ajit Singh. The Rana very graciously granted the young prince a *patta* for twelve villages including Kelawa and assured Durga Das of his help.³⁵

This was an open defiance of the emperor by the Rana. There was no going back now. The emperor sent Sarbuland Khan with a strong force on August 17, to occupy Mewar.³⁶ But his patience was exhausted by the slowness of the pace at which the things were moving. Too eager to punish the Rajputs, the emperor left Delhi on September 3, for Ajmer. The same day he despatched Prince Akbar ahead of him.³⁷

32 *Maasir*, 179.

33 *Bhim Sen*, 164. Khafi Khan (ii, 259-60) as quoted by Sarkar in *Aurangzeb*, vol. III, 399.

34 *Maasir*, 179, *Bhim Sen*, 165.

35 *Raj Vilas*, canto, ix, verses 171-206.

36 *Iskwar Das*, 766.

37 *Maasir*, 180-81.

On Thursday September 25, the emperor himself reached Ajmer. During the next month, that of Ramzan, the emperor himself was not very active, though his armies were busy completing the occupation of Marwar.

The Rana was not inactive either. He had perhaps sensed the nefarious intentions of Aurangzeb. It was all the more so when he received letters from Aurangzeb demanding his explanation for his *misconduct*. In the first two letters the emperor told the Rana that he was behaving in a very objectionable way. He had annoyed the emperor by giving shelter to the imperial outlaws—Ajit Singh and his train. The Rathors, so the emperor wrote to the Rana, had annoyed him by quarrelling with him at Agra (Delhi). Moreover they had occupied the whole of the country from Merta to Jodhpur, so the emperor charged the Rathors. The emperor therefore demanded the culprits. Raj Singh had already considered the implications of his action. He knew where he stood and what his conduct implied. But would he go back on his Rajput tradition and forget his duty towards a refugee? So the Rana wrote to inform Aurangzeb that whatever the fault of the Rathors was, he was going to do his duty of guarding them and refused to consider any such suggestions. The third letter from the emperor contained a bigger list of charges against the Sisodia Prince. He was charged of attacking Pur, a Mughal district. Moreover his conduct in attacking Deolia, a small state under the imperial protection, was questioned.³⁸ What had the Rana to say? And then again, of what avail had that explanation been? Had he not already given too many chances of annoyance to the emperor? He answered in the usual fashion and he knew the results. The matters had come to a crisis. His letter was found to be unsatisfactory.

The war which had already started against the Rathors was extended to the Sisodias and then began the long series of short engagements, the guerrilla warfare and the display of astute diplomacy on the part of the Rajputs as a result of which the emperor very nearly lost his throne.

YASHPAL

Br̥haspati Rāyamukūṭa and his Patron

(as known from the former's works)

Br̥haspati Rāyamukūṭa, originally called Br̥haspatimiśra, wrote several works, which are as follows:—

I. *Kumārasambhava-ṭīkā*, called Subodhā or Vyākhyā-br̥haspati.

[Eggeling, *Ind. Off. Cat.*, VII, p. 1420, No. 3765.—

Beginning: जयन्ति दृष्टिसम्बोध (१० संवाध०)-भिदुराः सङ्करच्छिदः ।

मुकुन्दचरणद्वन्द्वनखरेन्दुकरोर्मयः ॥१॥

विद्यासु तासु विनयी (प्रणयी) गुणेषु

गौडाधिपादुपचितप्रचुरप्रतिप्रः ।

सोऽहं यथामति बृहस्पतिरातनोमि

व्याख्याबृहस्पतिमलंकृतिकाव्यलिङ्गम् ॥२॥

Its colophon runs thus:

इति कुमारसम्भवटीकायां सुबोधायां बृहस्पतिमिश्रकृतायां गौरीविवाहो नाम सप्तमसर्गविवेचनम्॥

See also Eggeling, *op. cit.*, VII, p. 1418, No. 3757 (II) for another Ms. (of this com.) which has not been described by Eggeling.

At the end of the second Sarga the com. is called Subodhinī in both the Mss.]

II. *Raghuvamśa-ṭīkā*, called *Raghuvamśa-viveka* or Vyākhyā-br̥haspati.

[For Mss. of this com. see

(i) R. L. Mitra, *Notices of Sans. Mss.*, VI, pp. 243-4, No. 2181.—

It begins thus:

जयन्ति दृष्टिसम्बाधभिदुराः सं+रुच्छिदः ।

मुकुन्दचरणद्वन्द्वनखरेन्दुकरोर्मयः ॥१॥

चतुष्पदत्वं * * काम्यं

ततोप्यवद्यं खलु षट्पदत्वं ।

तदेव वाञ्छन्ति सुरासुर * *

* * * ॥२॥

दृग्भाविचरणद्वयपद्मशृङ्गो

गङ्गावगाहनविनोदविलङ्घिताघः ।

मायाप्रतिग्रहनिवृत्तधृतिप्रतिज्ञो

गोविन्द इत्यवनिनिर्ज्वरकुञ्जरोऽभूत् ॥३॥

तस्याङ्गनाभवदसीमगुणैरुदारैः

सालङ्कृता सुकृतिनीह मथायिनाम्नी ।

या वल्लभस्य वचनार्थविधानपुराये
 प्राणादपि... ..रूपदीकरोति ॥४॥
 ताभ्यामवाप्तजनुषो गुणाशीलमालो
 शालीनतादिगुणगौरवगुम्फितश्रीः ।
 यस्योचिता प्रियतमा प्रतिमानवृत्ति-
 र्मत्तेव निर्वृतिरभृद्भुवि निर्वृतीति (?) ॥५॥
 सन्दर्भशुद्धिगम्यगिरां गुरोर्यत्
वृता...मिश्र...सुमिश्रात ।
 विद्वत्सभासु विनयी प्रणायो गुणेषु
गौडाधिपादुपचितप्रचुरप्रतिष्ठः ॥६॥
 सोऽहं मतिवृहस्पतिः नल्पकाव्यो-
रघुवंशविवेकमेकं ।
 तत्तत्पुराणकृतिकीर्त्तिदुराशयाय
 ॥७॥

And its colophon states :

इति महीन्तापनीयकविचक्रवर्तिराज (? ० राज्य ०)-धराचार्य्यश्रीमद्वृहस्पतिमिश्रकृते रघुवंशविवेके
 व्याख्यावृहस्पतौ सप्तदशः सर्गः ॥

(ii) Eggeling, *Ind. Off. Cat.*, VII, p. 1415, No. 3743 (I).—

No description of this Ms. has been given by Eggeling.

(iii) Eggeling, *op. cit.*, VII, p. 1417, No. 3750.—

It begins thus :

जयन्ति दृष्टिसम्बोध (?) ० संवाध ०)-भिदुराः सङ्करच्छिदः ।
 मुकुन्दचरणद्वन्द्वनखरेन्दुकौर्मयः ॥१॥
 विद्यासु तासु विनयी प्रणायो गुणेषु
गौडाधिपादुपचितप्रचुरप्रतिष्ठः ।
 सोऽहं यथामति वृहस्पतिरातनोमि
 व्याख्यावृहस्पतिमलंकृतिकाव्यलिङ्गम् ॥२॥

And its colophon is as follows :

इति महीन्तापनीयकविचक्रवर्तिमिश्राचार्य्यश्रीमद्वृहस्पतिमिश्रकृते रघुवंशविवेके व्याख्यावृहस्पतावन-
 विंशतितमसर्गविवरणं समाप्तम् ॥]

III. *Sisupālavadhā-ṭikā*, called Nirṇaya-br̥haspati.

[Eggeling, *Ind. Off. Cat.*, VII, p. 1432.—

It contains only Sargas II-V of the com., with the colophon—

इति महीन्तापनीयकविचक्रवर्तिमिश्राचार्य्यश्रीमद्वृहस्पतिमिश्रकृते शिशुपालवधविवेचने निर्णयवृहस्पतौ
 ०सर्गः ॥]

IV. *Amarakoṣa-tīkā*, called *Pada-candrikā*.

[For Mss. of this com. see

- (i) Dacca University Ms. No. 985. This Ms., which is incomplete towards the end, begins thus:

अप्यास्ते यः सर्व्वे ध्रुव ईदृश इत्यगोचरो वचसः ।
 अहमिति संविद्विषयः पुरुषः स परं सनातनो जयति ॥१॥
 हेतुर्महतः सूक्ष्मा सत्यपि जगदुपरि गौरवं यस्याः ।
 श्रुतिपथ एव प्रमिता शक्तिः सा किल तनोतु मे कुशलम् ॥२॥
 श्रीवत्सलाञ्छनपदद्वयपद्मशृङ्गापयोऽन्वहविगाहनहोनपङ्कात् ।
 मायाप्रतिग्रहनिवर्त्तनसत्प्रतिज्ञाद्गोविन्दनामजनकाञ्जनकानुकारात् ॥३॥
 भर्तृव्रताचयशिरोमणिनां गतायाः सोमन्तिनीगुणशतैरभिनन्दितायाः ।
 दानव्रतौघविधिसाधिमूर्ध्नि धाम्ना मातुश्च शीलधृतनीलसुखायिदेव्याः ॥४॥
 योऽभूद् यस्य च योऽपि दद्मत्तगुणा भूमीरमा निर्गृती
 धत्ते यः कविचक्रवर्तिपदमस्याचार्य्यवर्य्यश्च यः ।
 राढायामपि गाढनिर्मलकुलञ्छलं कुलीनाग्रणी-
 र्यः प्रापत् प्रणतः परं हरिपदद्वन्द्वारविन्दे च यः ॥५॥
 ज्योतिष्मन्मणिपुञ्जमञ्जनरुचं हारं ज्वलत्कुण्डले
 रत्नौघच्छुरिता दशाङ्गलिजुषः शोचिष्मतीरुर्मिकाः ।
 यः प्राप्य द्विरदोषवी (? वि) श्रुतकन्धामै (? नै) रविन्दन्तृपा-
 ञ्छलेभैस्तुरंगैश्च रायमुकुटाभिहयामभिहयावतीम् ॥६॥
 यत्पुत्रा नृपमन्त्रिमौलिमणयो विश्वासराग्रद्वयः
 ख्याता दिग्जयिनामपीह जयिनो लोके कवीन्द्राश्च ये ।
 ब्रह्माण्डामरपादपादिसहितं येऽदुस्तुलापूरुषं
 तत्तद्वन्धविशेषनिर्मितकृतः कृतज्ञेषु शास्त्रेषु ते ॥७॥
 पुरयां परिडितसार्व्वभौमपदवीं गौडावनीपार्थिवाद्-
 यः प्राप्तः प्रथितो बृहस्पतिरिति क्ष्मालोकवाचस्पतिः ।
 कोषस्यामरनिर्मितस्य विविधव्याख्यानदोक्षागुरुः
 सानन्दं पदचन्द्रिकां स कुरुते टीकामिमां कीर्त्तये ॥८॥
 इयं षोडशटीकार्थसारमादाय निर्मिता ।
 अतोऽभिलिखितोऽर्थोऽस्यां न हेयः सहसा बुधैः ॥९॥

It is to be noted that in verse 5, line 2 the word अस्य is irrelevant and meaningless, because in the preceding lines there is no mention of the person to whom the word अस्य may refer. So, the reading 'अस्याचार्य्यवर्य्यश्च यः' should be substituted by 'अप्याचार्य्यवर्य्यश्च यः' (Ind. Off. Ms. No. 541) or 'अस्याचार्य्यवर्य्यश्च यः'. We shall see below that the title आचार्य was conferred on Bṛhaspati by his patron.

(ii) Dacca University Ms. No. 125B.—

This incomplete Ms. begins thus:

श्रीकृष्णः । परे अत ऊर्द्धं वक्ष्यमाणा अनेकार्था उच्यन्ते ।।

and ends with the words:

इति श्रीमद्बृहस्पतिमिश्रकृतायाममरकोषपञ्जिकायां पदचन्द्रिकाख्यायां लिङ्गादिमंग्रहवर्गः समाप्तः ।....।

The colophon

“इति महिन्तापनीयकविचक्रवर्तिराजपण्डितसार्वभौमकविपण्डितचूडामणिमहाचार्यरायमुकुट-
मणिश्रीमद्बृहस्पतिकृतायाममरकोषपञ्जिकायां पदचन्द्रिकाख्यायामनेकार्थवर्गः समाप्तः ॥”

occurs at the ends of the sections on Anekārtha-varga (fol. 4b) and Avyaya-
varga (fol. 8b).

(iii) Eggingling, *Ind. Off. Cat.*, II, pp. 270-1, Nos. 954, 955 (Mss. Nos. 541, 542).—

Ms. No. 541 begins with the same verses as the Dacca University Ms. No. 985 but has the following variations in readings:

Verse 1, line 2 —v.l. पुरातनः for सनातनः ;

Verse 2, line 2 —v.l. ०पथनवप्रतिमा for ०पथ एव प्रमिता, and करोतु for तनोतु ;

Verse 4, line 1 —v.l. ०गण० for ०चय०, ०गण० for ०गुण०, अपि for अभि० ;

Verse 4, line 2 —v.l. ०कोतिसीम्रो for ०धर्मधाम्नो ;

Verse 5, line 1 —v.l. भूयो रमा निर्वृता for भूमीरमा निर्वृती ;

Verse 5, line 2 —v.l. ०पदमप्याचार्य० for ०पदमस्याचार्य० ;

Verse 6, line 1 —v.l. ०पुञ्जजनरुचिं for ०पुञ्जमञ्जनरुचं ;

Verse 6, lines 3-4—v.l. द्विरदोपविष्टसकलन्नानरविन्दन्तृपाच्छलेतैस्तुरगैश्च
(original reading—द्विरदोपविष्टसकलनकलानैव-
विन्दन्तृपाच्छलेतैस्तुरगैश्च) for द्विरदोपवीष्टकनक
etc. ;

Verse 7, line 1 —v.l. नृपमन्त्रिमूलमणयो विश्रामरामादयः (A. Barooah
reads विश्वासरामादयः) for नृपमन्त्रिमौलिमणयो
विश्वासरायादयः ;

Verse 8, line 1 —v.l. गौडावनीवासवात् for गौडावनीपार्थिवात् ;

Verse 9, line 2 —v.l. अस्याः for अस्यां

And it ends thus: इति महिन्तापनीयकविचक्रवर्तिराजपण्डितसार्वभौमकविपण्डित-
चूडामणिमहाचार्यरायमुकुटमणिश्रीमद्बृहस्पतिकृतायाममरकोषपञ्जिकायां पदचन्द्रिकाख्यायां...॥

(iv) Eggingling, *Ind. Off. Cat.*, II, p. 271, No. 956.—

This Ms. is incomplete, breaking off abruptly in the Brāhmaṇa-varga.

That the *Pada-candrikā* was written in Śaka 1353 (A.D. 1431-32) is evidenced by the author in the section on Time and the Yugas in fol. 49 of this Ms. (Ms. 541, fol. 5 ; D.U. Ms. No. 985, fol. 57a):

इदानीं च शकाब्दाः १३५३ द्वाविंशदब्दाधिक (I.O. Ms. 541 and D.U. Ms. 985—द्वाविंशदधिक) पञ्चवर्षोत्तरचतुःसहस्रवर्षाणि कलिसंख्याया (Ms. 541—०संख्या) भूतानि ४५३२ ।

(v) Eggeling, *op. cit.*, II, p. 272, No. 957.—

It ends thus:

इति अमरचन्द्रिकायां रायमुकुटसारोद्गारे लिगादिसंग्रहवर्गविवरणम् ।....।

(vi) R. L. Mitra, *Notices of Sans. Mss.*, IV, p. 273, No. 1702.—

Beginning:

ॐ अध्यास्ते यः सर्वं ध्रुव ईदृश इत्यगोचरो वचनः ।

अहमिति संविद्विषयः पुरुषः स परः पुगननो जयति ॥१॥

अभीष्टदेवतानमस्कारायपनीतमदृष्टं हि विघ्नापरनामकसाध्यप्रतिबन्धकाश्रमतिरोधानद्वारा etc.

Colophon:

इ श्री य क ता मम को पं का पदचन्द्रिकायां लिङ्गादिमंग्रहविवरणं समाप्तम् ।

(vu) Hrishikesh Shastri and Shiva Chandra Gui, *Descr. Cat. of Sans. Mss., Calcutta Sans. College*, VII, Lexicography, pp. 12-13, No. 22.—

This is an old, worm-eaten Ms. written in Devanāgarī and dated Samvat 1867.

Beginning:

श्रीगणेशाय नमः ।

अध्यास्ते यः सर्वं ध्रुव ईदृश इत्यगोचरो वचनः ।

अहमिति संविद्विषयः पुरुषः स परः पुरातनो जयति ॥१॥

अभीष्टदेवतानमस्कारायपनीतमन्तर्हि (?) विघ्नापरनामकसाध्यप्रतिबन्धकतिरोधानद्वारा etc.

Colophon:

इति महितापनीयकवचकर्त्तिराजपण्डितसार्वभौमचूडामणिमहाचार्यरायमुकुटमणिश्रीमद्वृह-
स्पतिकृतायामरकोषपञ्जिकायां पदचन्द्रिकायां लिङ्गादिमंग्रहवर्गविवरणं समाप्तम् ।....॥

(viii) Haraprasad Shastri, *Cat. of Palm-leaf and Selected Paper Mss. belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal, Calcutta* 1905, p. 23.

No description of the Ms. has been given by Mm. Shastri.]

V. *Rāyamukūṭa-paddhati*, which is mentioned by Raghunandana in his *Śrāddha-tattva* and *Suddhi-tattva* (see *Smṛti-tattva*, I, pp. 213, 281 and 283).

No Ms. of this work has been discovered as yet.

Whether this work is the same as Rāyamukūṭa's *Smṛti-ratnabāra* cannot be said definitely until the references to the former have been traced in the latter.

Though the introductory verses and the colophons of Bṛhaspati's works, as given above, are replete with informations regarding Bṛhaspati himself and his family, we are practically at a loss to identify the 'Gaudādhīpa' (king of Gauḍa) who patronised him and made him famous (cf. *gauḍādhīpād upacita-pracura-pratiṣṭhaḥ*). The introductory verses of Bṛhaspati's *Smṛti-ratnabāra*, however, give us some information in this direction.

VI. *Smṛti-ratnabāra*, a comprehensive digest on the proper time and procedure of Hindu rites and ceremonies.

[Haraprasad Shastri, *Descr. Cat. of Sans. Mss.*, ASB, III, pp. 226-30, No. 2138.

The beginning of this Ms., which is incomplete towards the end, is given by Mm. Shastri as follows:

नमो गणपतये ।

कमलकुमुदमुद्रातङ्कसङ्कोचिशौचेः

नयनललितनीलोक्तासितार्थाविलासः ।

सजलजलदरोविश्वधलाचारुचेलः

कन ॥१॥

... स्थपतिकं विष्णुद्वाःस्थमकन्दुदीपकम् ।

जगदन्तःपुरं यस्य तदीशान्तःपुरं स्तुवे ॥२॥

जीयाद्यं स जगदन्तसुतोऽतिवेल-

स्तैस्तैर्गुणैः ।

... पा-निजभुजव्रविणार्जितश्रीः

श्रीरायराज्यधरनाम पदं प्रपन्नः ॥३॥

भैनाधिपत्यमिभसैन्धवतूर्यशङ्ख-

च्छ्रवावलीललितकाञ्चनरूप्य ।

... दान बहुभूषणश्च

जल्लादीननृपतिमुदितो गुणैर्धैः ॥४॥

यो ब्रह्माण्डकनक्तुरगस्यन्दनं विश्वचक्रं

पृथ्वीं कृष्णाजि(न)सुरतरुन् धेनुशैलोदरींश्च ।

..... धिवदवनीदेवतानाममन्दं

भिन्दन् दैन्यं सपदि दधते धर्मसुनोरभिव्याम् ॥५॥

जन्मास्तं जगदन्ततो गुणनिधेर्भूर्द्धामि(षिक्ता)न्वये

दाराः सन्तति.....तिः श्रीभास्कराः सूनवः ।

लक्ष्मीरङ्गतदानभोगसुभोगा मन्त्रित्वसुर्व्वीभुजा-
 मित्य' यस्य मनोरथाय कृतिनः किञ्चिन्न काम्यं स्थितम् ॥६॥
 आचार्य इत्यभिमतं कविचक्र(वर्त्ता)
द्वितयमध्यगमततो यः ।
 स श्रीबृहस्पतिरिमं बहुसंप्रहार्थै-
 निर्म्मति निर्म्मलमतिः स्मृतिरत्नहारम् ॥७॥
 प्राचीनाः संप्रहाः सन्ति सत्यं सद्भिर्बोधकाः ।
 किन्त्वशेषा.....होयं विविच्यते ॥८॥

It is evident that these verses, except the first two which contain salutations to Viṣṇu and his wife, contain valuable materials for the study of the history of mediaeval Bengal; but the occurrence of the name 'जगदन्त' in verses 3 and 6, and of the word 'मन्त्रित्व०' in verse 6 obscure the meaning of these verses, and we are practically at a loss to discover the person or persons whom Bṛhaspati Rāyamukūṭa connects with the events mentioned in these verses.

Some scholars are of opinion that in these verses Bṛhaspati eulogises his patron whose father's name was 'Jagadanta' and who was a petty chief or a zeminder under Jalaluddin and had the title 'Śrī-rāya-rājayadhara.' But this view is not supported by the words 'gauḍādhipād upacita-pracura-pratiṣṭhaḥ' occurring in the introductory verses of Bṛhaspati Rāyamukūṭa's commentaries on Kālidāsa's *Kumāra-sambhava* and *Raghuvamśa* as well as by the line 'puṇyāṃ paṇḍita-sārvabhauma-padavīm gauḍāvanī-pārthivāt (v.l. °vāsa-vāt for °pārthivāt in *Ind. Off. Cat.*) yaḥ prāptaḥ etc.' which occurs in the 8th introductory verse of the *Pada-candrikā*. These show definitely that Bṛhaspati Rāyamukūṭa was highly respected and patronised by the 'king of Gauḍa'. Hence there is no reason why Bṛhaspati should remain in the court of a petty chief under Jalaluddin, king of Gauḍa. Moreover, it is difficult to conceive how this patron of Bṛhaspati, if he were a petty chief under Jalaluddin, could accept ministership under more kings than one (cf. **मन्त्रित्वसुर्व्वीभुजाम्**—verse 6). Again, these verses (3-6) cannot be taken to point to Bṛhaspati himself, because (i) from the introductory verses of Bṛhaspati's commentaries on the *Raghuvamśa* and the *Amarakoṣa* we know that Bṛhaspati's father's name was Govinda and not 'Jagadanta', and (ii) the word 'tataḥ' (meaning 'from him') in verse 7

(ācārya ityabhimataṃ kavicakra[varṭti] * * * dvitayam adhyagamata
 tato yaḥ/

sa śrībṛhaspatiḥ.....nirmāti.....smṛtiratnahāraṃ//)

shows clearly that the preceding verses (3-6) must be applied not to Bṛhaspati Rāyamukūṭa but to his patron who conferred on him the titles 'Ācārya' and 'Kavi-cakravartin'. These verses cannot also be applied to Rājā Gaṇeśa (father of Jalaluddin), because (i) Jalaluddin could never appoint his father as his Senāpati (for, it was after Gaṇeśa's death that Jalaluddin had the control of the kingdom in his hand) and bestow on him elephants, horses etc., (cf. verse 4) and (ii) 'the ministership of kings' (mantritvam urvibhujām—verse 6) could never be a 'kāmya' of Gaṇeśa who had become the ruler of Bengal.

It is thus evident that the interpretation of these verses is beset with difficulties. We shall however try in our own way to find out a solution for these perplexing riddles.

In the introductory verses of his commentaries on the *Kumāra-saṃbhava* and the *Raghuvamśa* Bṛhaspati calls himself 'gauḍādhipād upacita-pracura-pratiṣṭhaḥ' (lit. 'who received sufficient recognition from the king of Gauḍa') and in the introductory verses 6 and 8 of his *Amarakoṣa-tīkā* he says that he received from the 'king (or Vāsava, with v.l. वासवात् for पार्थिवात्) of Gauḍa' a necklace set with bright jewels, a pair of shining ear-rings, ten lustrous finger-rings set with gems, the famous title 'Rāya-mukūṭa' along with presents of umbrellas, elephants and horses, and the merited title 'Paṇḍita-sārvabhauma'. In his *Amarakoṣa-tīkā* Bṛhaspati states that this work was composed by him in Śaka 1353 (A.D. 1431-32, which was the last year of Jalaluddin's reign). These facts, along with the mention of 'King Jalālādīna' as conferring elephants, horses etc. (on some body) in the introductory verse 4 of the *Smṛti-ratnahāra*, tend to show that the introductory verses 3-6 of the *Smṛti-ratnahāra*, are to be taken to point to Jalaluddin. But as we know that Jalaluddin was a son of Gaṇeśa and a paramount ruler of Bengal, we should read 'गजदन्त' (which is a synonym for 'गणेश') in place of 'जगदन्त' in verses 3 and 6, and 'यन्त्रित्वम्' (i.e. the state or position of a controller, restrainer or curber) for 'मन्त्रित्वम्' in verse 6. The confusion between 'गजदन्त' and 'जगदन्त'¹ and between य and म is not at all improbable. In his *Śvāddha-kaumudī* Govindānanda says that as the letters य and म were written in almost the same way, Śrīnātha wrongly read

1 This confusion was caused most probably by their similarity of sound as well as by the word 'जगदन्तःपुरं' occurring in the third Pāda of verse 2.

‘तथैवामन्वितो’ for ‘तथैव यन्वितो’ (*Śrāddha-kaumudī*, p. 96—यमः—‘तथैव यन्वितो दाता.....॥’ यन्वितो नियमस्थः.....। अत्राधुनिकैर्लिपिसादृश्यमोहितैरामन्वित इति पाठं मत्वा.....इति व्याख्यातम् ।) If we accept these two readings, all the introductory verses of the *Smṛti-ratnahāra* attain relevance and cogency of meaning, and we may translate these verses thus:

(Verses 3-4). Victory be to king Jallāladīna, son of Gajadanta (i.e. Gaṇeśa), who excelled with his numerous merits * * *, earned his fortune by means of the power of his own arms, received the title ‘Śrī-rāya-rājyadhara’, and, being delighted with the multitudes of qualifications (of Bṛhaspati), [conferred on him] the command of his army and [gave him] many ornaments as well as elephants, horses, and golden and silvern * * * made graceful with tūryas (a kind of musical instrument), conch-shells and lines of umbrellas;

(Verse 5). Who in no time won the ‘appellation of ‘the son of Dharma’ (i.e. Yudhiṣṭhira) by immediately destroying, like * *, the poverty of the terrestrial gods (i.e. Brāhmaṇas) [by giving away] the Brahmāṇḍa, golden chariots fitted with horses, the Viśva-cakra, the Earth, Kṛṣṇājina, the divine tree (i.e. Kalpataru), cows, hillocks and (?) (cf. dhenu-śailōdarīmś ca);

(Verse 6). Who derived his birth from Gajadanta (i.e. Gaṇeśa), a receptacle of virtues, in a royal (or Kṣatriya?) family; whose wife (or wives * * * [was or were productive of?]) children, and sons were, as it were, so many divine Suns (or ‘whose sons were shining with beauty or fortune’—with the reading ‘श्रीमाखुराः’ for ‘श्रीमासुराः’); to whom Fortune became highly enjoyable through extraordinary donations and enjoyments; who attained the position of the restrainer (or curber) of kings;—and thus to whom, a blessed man that he was, there was nothing that could be an object of desire.

(Verse 7). Bṛhaspati, who received from him two honourable (or desirable) [titles viz.] ‘Ācārya’ and ‘Kavicakra’(vartī),’ composes, with a clear conception, the *Smṛtiratnahāra* with the (help of the) meanings of numerous digests.

From the introductory verses and colophons of Rāyamukūṭa’s works, as given above, we gather the following informations about Bṛhaspati Rāyamukūṭa and his patron:

Bṛhaspati Rāyamukūṭa

- (i) Bṛhaspati was originally an inhabitant of Rāḍha and belonged to the Mahintā Gāñī of Rāḍhī Brāhmaṇas. He calls himself 'kulīnāgraṇī'.²
- (ii) His father was Govinda and his mother Nīlasukhāyī-devī. Govinda was a pious and learned Vaiṣṇava and used to take his bath daily in the Ganges (Bhāgīrathī?), while Nīlasukhāyī-devī also was adorned with all the qualities of the head and heart. Bṛhaspati's wife's name was Nirvṛtī (or Nirvṛtā).
- (iii) In course of time Bṛhaspati came over to Gauḍa and was accepted by Jalaluddin as his Ācārya (cf. 'ācāryavaryaś ca yaḥ', and 'rāja(ṛāja)dhara'—'Rāya-rājyadhara' being a title given to Jalaluddin; see below). It is not known what brought Bṛhaspati there, and when. It is probable that Bṛhaspati had passed over to Gauḍa even before Rājā Gaṇeśa came into power as the ruler of Bengal.³ Whenever Bṛhaspati might have come to Gauḍa, he had little position in the court of Rājā Gaṇeśa, as his remarkable silence about this king shows.
- (iv) Though Bṛhaspati might have been present in Gauḍa when Gaṇeśa had regal power in his hands, it was during Jalaluddin's reign that Bṛhaspati wrote his works. Bṛhaspati's silence about Gaṇeśa, as contrasted with his eloquent eulogy of Jalaluddin, is sufficient evidence in this direction.

We have already seen that the *Pada-candrikā* was written by Bṛhaspati in 1431-32 A.D., i.e. in the last year of Jalaluddin's reign. The *Smṛti-ratnabhāra* was written earlier than the *Pada-candrikā*; because in the

2 It is to be noted that in the Ghaṭaka-kula-śāstras the Mahintā Gāñī:s are not regarded as kulīna.

According to Nagendra Nath Basu the village Mahintā is to be identified with the present Mahatā, which is situated on the right bank of the Bhāgīrathī and lies 30 miles south of Murshidabad and 5 miles northwest of Plassy. (See Nagendra Nath Basu, *Vaṅger Jātiya Itihās*, Brāhmaṇa-kāṇḍa, Prathamamśa, p. 123).

3 This supposition is based on the probable connexion of Kṛttivāsa with Bṛhaspati Rāyamukūṭa. See *infra*.

'Gaṇeśa was virtually the king of Bengal from 813H (i.e. 1410 A.D.), the year of the accession of Shaifuddin Hamza Shah,.....'—N. K. Bhattachali, *Coins and Chronology of the Early Independent Sultans of Bengal*, p. 117.

introductory verses of the former work there is mention only of the titles 'Ācārya' and 'Kavi-cakra[vartī]', whereas in the introductory verses of the latter we find the mention of the titles 'Rāyamukūṭa' and 'Paṇḍita-sārvabhauma' also.

(v) Bṛhaspati received the titles 'Ācārya', 'Kavi-cakravartī', 'Rāyamukūṭa' and 'Paṇḍita-sārvabhauma' from Jalaluddin in recognition of his talents. While receiving the title of 'Rāyamukūṭa', he was bathed (with golden jars?) on an elephant; and rich presents of umbrellas, elephants and horses were made to him by his patron on that occasion. He also received, on other occasions, presents of a necklace, two ear-rings, and ten finger-rings—all set with valuable gems, and of elephants, horses etc. from Jalaluddin. Thus Bṛhaspati became a man of great fortune and was by no means a poor Brahmin scholar.

(vi) Bṛhaspati was given by Jalaluddin the charge of the army.

(vii) Bṛhaspati must have come to Gauḍa at an advanced age, because he says in his *Pada-candrikā* that his 'sons', named Viśvāsārāya (v.l. Viśvāsa-rāma or Viśrāma-rāma) and others(?),⁴ were, as it were, so many gems on the crests of the king's (i.e. Jalaluddin's) ministers, defeated (in debate) those scholars who had conquered the quarters, were themselves great poets, made donations of Tulā-puruṣa as well as the Brahmāṇḍa, the divine tree (i.e. Kalpataru), etc., and wrote valuable works on all the different branches of learning.

Thus it is clear that Bṛhaspati's 'sons' were already sufficiently grown up when he was in the court of Jalaluddin.

(viii) Bṛhaspati was a Vaiṣṇava, and perhaps a Śākta Vaiṣṇava, as he mentions Viṣṇu's wife as his Śakti. (See verse 2 of the *Pada-candrikā*).

Jalaluddin

(i) Jalaluddin, son of Gaṇeśa, was born in a royal (or Kṣatriya?) family.

4 If in the 7th introductory verse of the *Pada-candrikā* the reading 'viśvāsa-rāyādayaḥ khyātāḥ' is taken to be the original one, it may also mean 'who were well-known as Viśvāsa, Rāya and others' (i.e. with the titles Viśvāsa, Rāya, etc.).

- (ii) He had many qualities of the head and heart, earned his fortune with the power of his own arms, and was a restrainer or curber of kings (i.e. was a paramount ruler).
- (iii) He received the title Śrī-rāya-rājyadhara. It is for this reason that Br̥haspati, who was accepted by Jalaluddin as his Ācārya, is called 'Rāja(?Rājya) dharācārya' in the colophon of a Ms. of his *Raghuvamśa-tīkā* (see *ante*).
- (iv) He had 'sons' and perhaps more wives than one. So he was fairly aged when he became the king of Gauḍa.
- (v) As soon as Jalaluddin ascended the throne⁵ he destroyed the poverty of Brahmīns by making big donations, viz., the Brahmāṇḍa, the golden horse-and-chariot, the Viśva-cakra, the Earth, Kṛṣṇājīna, etc., and won the appellation of the 'Son of Dharma' (i.e. Yudhiṣṭhira). Thus Jalaluddin, though converted to Muhammadanism, was very kind towards the Hindus and looked to their welfare.⁶
- (vi) He encouraged Hindu culture and learning by appreciating the merits of Br̥haspati and conferring on him the titles 'Ācārya', 'Kavi-cakravartī', 'Rāyamukūṭa' and 'Paṇḍita-sārvabhauma' along with rich presents of valuable ornaments, elephants, horses, etc. The title 'Rāyamukūṭa' (lit. 'the crest of Rāya i.e. Jalaluddin') and the great honour that was shown to Br̥haspati prove that this scholar was held in high esteem by Jalaluddin.

5 Cf. the word सपदि in introductory verse 5 of the *Smṛti-ratnabhāra*.

6 About Jalaluddin Ferista says.

'After the death of his father, Jeetmal called together all the officers of the state, and said, so strong a desire to become a convert to the Muhammadan faith had seized him, that he was resolved to embrace that religion; observing at the same time, if the chiefs would not permit him to succeed to the throne, he was prepared to cede it to his brother. His officers declared, they were disposed to accept him as their king, without any reference to the religion he might choose to adopt. So that several learned men among the Mahomedans of that country were summoned to witness Raja Jeetmal renounce the Hindu religion, and profess that of the Moslems. He was at the same time entitled Julal-ood-Deen; and after ascending the throne, he ruled with such justice that he became entitled to the appellation of the Nowsherwan of the age. He reigned with great splendour for a period of seventeen years and died in the latter end of the year 812'. (See John Briggs, *History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India till the year 1612*, vol. IV, p. 337).

- (vii) It has already been said that Jalaluddin gave Bṛhaspati the charge of his army, and that Bṛhaspati's sons were held in high esteem by Jalaluddin's ministers, who, or at least the majority of whom, thus seem to have been Hindus. (The line 'yat-putrā nrpa-mantri-mauli-maṇayo etc.' may also be taken to mean that Bṛhaspati's sons were appointed as chief ministers by Jalaluddin). So it is evident that Jalaluddin, though converted to Muhammadanism, was greatly controlled by the Hindus in matters of administration, and his reign can thus be called the reign of a Hindu monarch.

These are all the informations that we can gather about Jalaluddin from Bṛhaspati Rāyamukūṭa's works. Though these informations differ much from those contained in the *Rīyazu-s-Salatīn* which describes Jalaluddin as a zealous Muhammadan converting many Hindus to the Muhammadan faith and tyrannising those Brāhmins who took part in his re-conversion to Hinduism, they are presented before the learned circle for full consideration as regards their historical value.

Here we are tempted to say a few words on the probable connexion of Kṛttivāsa (if he was born in the month of Māgha in Śaka 1320, i.e., in January, 1399 A.D.) with Bṛhaspati Rāyamukūṭa.

In his *Ātma-vivaraṇa*⁸ which he annexed to his famous Bengali *Rāmāyaṇa*, Kṛttivāsa says that when he completed the 11th year of his life and entered the 12th (i.e. after January, 1410 A.D.), he went to the northern country *after crossing the big Gaṅgā* (i.e. the Padmā and not the Bhāgīrathī)⁹ and read with a teacher who was 'like Vyāsa, Vasiṣṭha, Vālmīki and Cyavana' and 'looked as much spirited as Brahmā'. After finishing his

7 For Kṛttivāsa's date of birth, see N. K. Bhattachali, *Kṛttivāsaviracita Rāmāyaṇa*, Ādi-kāṇḍa, Bhūmikā, pp. ff.; Jogesh Chandra Roy in *Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrikā*, 1340 B.S., pp. 13 ff.

8 For the full text of Kṛttivāsa's *Ātma-vivaraṇa* see *Kṛttivāsaviracita Rāmāyaṇa*, Ādi-kāṇḍa (ed. N. K. Bhattachali, Dacca 1936), pp. 173-5; also Bhūmikā, pp. v and vii-viii.

9 If the line 'पादेर निमित्त गेलाम बड गङ्गा पार' is taken to mean that Kṛttivāsa went to read with a teacher whose residence was situated *on the bank of the Padmā*, then we are to assume that Bṛhaspati Rāyamukūṭa, who, as we shall see presently, seems to have been Kṛttivāsa's teacher, lived somewhere on the southern bank of the Padmā not very far from the town of Gauḍa. But this assumption does not seem to be very cogent. See the next footnote.

education and taking leave of his teacher he first thought of returning home, but a desire for becoming a Rāja-pañḍita arose in his mind. Consequently he went to the court of the king of Gauḍa, which, as Kṛttivāsa's account shows, was not situated at any long distance from his teacher's residence¹⁰ and where he found, among others, Mukunda as the Rāja-pañḍita.

In Kṛttivāsa's Ātma-vivarāṇa as contained in an incomplete Ms. of the Ayodhyā-kāṇḍa of his *Rāmāyaṇa* the following couplet occurs:

राडा मधै वन्दीनु आचार्यबुडामणि ।
जार ठाइ किर्तिवास पडिला आपुनि ॥¹¹

'In Rāḍha I pay homage to Ācārya-cūḍāmaṇi, with whom Kṛttivāsa himself read'. As this couplet is not found in any other Ms. its authenticity is extremely doubtful. Authentic or not, its value lies in recording a tradition or individual opinion which should not be neglected.

Though we know that the title 'Ācārya-cūḍāmaṇi' has been used by the successors of Śrīnāthācārya-cūḍāmaṇi to mean none but Śrīnātha,¹² it is highly probable that by this title the author of the above mentioned couplet means Bṛhaspati Rāyamukuta who also was originally a resident of Rāḍha, received, among other things, the title 'Ācārya' from Jalaluddin, and is called 'Pañḍita-cūḍāmaṇi' (and once simply 'Cūḍāmaṇi') in the final colophon of the Ms. of his *Smṛti-ratnahāra* as well as in those of some of the Mss. of his *Amarakoṣa-tikā*.

All the above facts taken together tend to show that Kṛttivāsa, who went over to Gauḍa at the age of twelve, read with Bṛhaspati Rāyamukuta and then went to the court of Rājā Gaṇeśa, where he was cordially received by the king and asked to write his famous *Rāmāyaṇa*.

R. C. HAZRA

¹⁰ It is to be noted that no river is said to have been crossed by Kṛttivāsa while passing from his teacher's residence to the court of the king of Gauḍa.

¹¹ Basantaranjan Ray and Basanta Kumar Chatterjee, *Descriptive Catalogue of Bengali Mss.*, Vol. I, p. 234, No. 1717; also Introduction, p. ix.

¹² All information on this point has been given in the Introduction to my forthcoming edition of Śrīnāthācārya-cūḍāmaṇi's *Kṛtya-tattvārṇava*.

Date and Works of Rāyamukūṭa

Br̥haspati Miśra, better known by one of his many titles of distinction, viz., 'Rāyamukūṭa', was a most prominent figure in the literary history of Bengal in the 15th cent. A.D. The late Mm. H. P. Śāstrī collected all available information about him in one of his last papers in Bengali.¹

As early as 1807 A.D. Colebrooke examined Rāyamukūṭa's commentary on the *Amarakoṣa* and ascertained its age "from the incidental mention of a date viz. 1353 Śaca, or 4532 of the Kaliyuga, corresponding to A.D. 1431."² This date has ever since been regarded as a happy *terminus ad quem* for a large number of authors and books. The presumption that such an incidental mention of a date in a book exactly coincides with the date of its composition, far from being ever questioned by anybody, has gained here almost an unassailable ground in course of over a century, though it proves now to be wrong in the case of Rāyamukūṭa as we shall presently find.

As far as can be ascertained now the remarkable career of this great scholar of Bengal was roughly divided into three distinct periods. Most of his literary works were written in the first period when he was enjoying the patronage of a nobleman named Rāya Rājyadhara. Unfortunately none of these early works of Rāyamukūṭa are at present available for examination except the unique fragment of his *Smṛti* digest '*Smṛti-ratnabāra*', now preserved in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.*

As a few leaves at the beginning of this Ms. are torn at the sides the introductory verses are mutilated. Verses 3-6 give a glowing description of the author's patron named Rāya Rājyadhara, who belonged to a family of *Mūrdhābhīṣikta* (v. 6) and was the son of a nobleman named Jagadatta. Sultan Jalaluddin, evidently the son of Rājā Gaṇeśa, being pleased with his virtues appointed him a commander-in-chief with a pom-

1 *Sāhitya-Parīṣat-Patrikā*, vol. XXXVIII, pp. 57-64 (1338 B.E.).

2 *Kośa* by Umura Singha, ed. by H. T. Colebrooke, 1807, Preface, p. vii.

* Our grateful thanks are due to the authorities of that learned body, specially to the Secretary Dr. B. S. Guha, for readily allowing us facilities to examine and take notes and extracts from this and other valuable manuscripts.

pous display of high honours.³ We wonder what led the late Dr. Śāstri to suppose that Jagadatta was identical with Rājā Gaṇeśa and Rāya Rājyadhara with his son Jadu. Verse 4 even in its mutilated form clearly makes Rājyadhara a protégé of Sultan Jalaluddin and in verse 6 Rājyadhara is stated to have reached his peak of fortune by being a royal minister. This together with the mention of a son named Bhāskara and the long roll of his rich religious gifts enumerated in v. 5 proves the absurdity of the late Dr. Śāstri's supposition. The reference to Jalaluddin (d. 1431 A.D.) without any honorific adjuncts seems to indicate that the Sultan was dead when the book was actually written. The author writes about himself as follows (we have filled up the lacunae by guess):—

आचार्य्य इत्यभिमतं कविचक्र(वर्त्ति-) (त्याह्यापद-) द्वितयमध्यगमततो यः ।

स श्रीवृहस्पतिरिमं बहुसंग्रहार्थं निम्माति निम्मलमतिः स्मृतिरन्नहारं ॥

An important fact is recorded here that the author, whose real name was Brhaspati, earned (for the first time) two titles of distinction 'Ācārya' and 'Kavicakravartī' from Rāya Rājyadhara. This book was, therefore, written under the patronage of Rājyadhara, before the author earned several other titles including the wellknown 'Rāyamukṭa.' There is evidence to show

3 *Descr. Cat. of Sans. Mss.* (Govt. collection), A.S.B., vol. III, pp. 226-30. A few corrections are necessary in the verses as printed in the Cat.:—

Read शोचिः) for शौचे: (V. 1)

„ जगदत्त „ जगदन्त (V. 2 & 5)

„ ब्रह्माण्ड...०दधीश्च „ ब्रह्माण्ड.....०दरीश्च (V. 5)

„ दाराः संतुलिता „ दाराः सन्तति... (V. 6)

Verse 4 reads:—

सैनाधिपत्यमिभ-सैन्धव-तूर्य्यशङ्ख-

च्छत्रावलीललितकाञ्चनरूप्य × × ।

× × × × (अ)दान् (? द)बहुभूषणम्

जलालदीननृपतिमुदितो गुणैः ॥

For Dr. Śāstri's views vide *Sāhitya-Parīṣat-Patrikā*, op. cit., p. 69. Apparently he was then influenced by the views of the late Mr. N. N. Vasu who regarded Rājā Gaṇeśa, on the strength of genealogical works, to belong to a Kāyastha 'Datta' family: vide *Castes and Sects of Bengal*, Kāyastha Kāṇḍa vol. V (= Uttara-Rāḍhiya-Kāyastha-Kāṇḍa, pt. iii) pp. 84-9. The names Jagadatta, Rājyadhara and Bhāskara are, however, quite untraceable in the genealogies printed in this book.

that most of his literary works were written about this period. Only four of these works have yet been discovered:—

(1) *Bodhavatī* comm. on the *Meghadūta*. The colophon runs:—

काव्यप्रकाशविषयार्थविवेकदत्तां यः पञ्चिका(म)कृत पुञ्जितमञ्जुपत्ताम् ।

सोऽयं बृहस्पतिकविः कविवद्ध(सख्यां) टीकामिमां व्यधित बोधवतीत्यभिर्यां ॥

इति श्रीमहिन्तापनीय-कविचक्रवर्ति-राज(इज्य)धराचार्य्य-श्रीबृहस्पतिविरचित-मेघदूत-टीका
बोधवती समाप्ता ॥⁴

There is no *maṅgalācarana* at the beginning and the final verse cited above records that the author had previously written a comm. (*Pañjikā*) on the *Kāvyaṣṭakāśa* which has not yet been discovered. This commentary was undoubtedly written under the patronage of Rājyadhara as the interesting epithet 'Rājyadharaścārya' proves.

(2) *Subodhā* comm. on the *Kumārasambhava*. The colophon to the only Ms. copy of the book hitherto discovered simply states "बृहस्पतिमिश्रकृतायः"⁵

(3) *Vyākhyā-Bṛhaspati* or the *Raghuvamśauveka*. The Ms. copy of this valuable work described by R. L. Mitra contains an introduction of 7 verses, where in vv. 3-7 a detailed account of the author's family appears for the first time. These verses, though mutilated in the original copy, are reproduced below being restored with the help of other Mss.

(यः कै)टभारिचरणद्वयपद्मशृङ्गो गङ्गावगाहनविनोदविलङ्घिताघः ।

मायाप्रतिग्रहनिवृत्तवृत्तिप्रतिज्ञो गोविन्द इत्यवनिनिर्ज्वरकुञ्जरोऽभूत् ॥

तस्याङ्गनाभवदसीमगुणैरुदारैः सालङ्कृता सुकृति(नीलसुखायि-)नाम्नी ।

या बल्लभस्य वचनार्थविधानपुण्ये प्राणादपि (प्रियमतो) रूपदोकरोति ॥

ताभ्यामवाप्तजनुषो गुणशोलमाली शालोनतादिगुणगौरवगुम्फितश्रीः ।

यस्योचिता प्रियतमा प्रतिमानवृत्तिर्मुसैव निर्वृतिरभूद्भुवि निर्वृतेति ॥

सन्दर्भशुद्धिमधिगम्य गिरां गुरो(र्यः) (श्रीधीधराद्विधृतमिश्रपदः) सुमिथात् ।

विद्वत्सभासु विनयी प्रणयी गुरोषु गौडाधिपादुपचितप्रचुरप्रतिष्ठः ॥

सोऽहं (यथा-)मति बृहस्पति (रातनोमि) (व्याख्याबृहस्पतिमलङ्कृतिकाव्यलिङ्गं)

× × × × रघुवंशविवेकमेतं । तत्तत्पुराणकृतिकीर्तिदुराशयाय ॥

The colophon to this copy runs:—

इति महिन्तापनीय-कविचक्रवर्ति-राज्यधराचार्य्य-श्रीमदबृहस्पतिमिश्रकृते रघुवंशविवेके
व्याख्याबृहस्पतो सप्तदशः सर्गः ।

4 H. P. Śāstri: *Notices of Sans. Mss.*, vol. IV, pp. 169-70. No. 225; the Ms. is complete in 39 fol.

5 Eggeling: *Ind. Off. Cat.*, p. 1420.

Besides furnishing the names of the author's parents and wife, the above account also records the name of his teacher 'Śrīdhara Mīśra' who dubbed him a Mīśra, one of the foremost academic titles of that time. The colophon proves that he was still patronised by Rājyadhara.⁶

(4) *Nirṇaya-Bṛhaspati* on the *Śisupālavadha*. Fragments of this work so far discovered point to its being a sister work of the same period as above and the colophons here also stop with the mention of the two early titles 'Ācārya' and 'Kavicakravartī.'

The Ms. copy of the *Smṛti-ratnabhāra*, though a fragment (of 254 fol.), constitutes a landmark in the history of *Dharmaśāstra* in Bengal and the late Dr. Śāstrī rightly emphasised on its great value. It is replete with rare and valuable quotations from a large number of works and gives a vivid glimpse of the extraordinary richness of the *Smṛti* literature in Bengal in the centuries preceding the 15th. Unfortunately the list of authorities cited in the Descriptive Catalogue omits many important names and so we give below a complete alphabetical list of all the later authorities mentioned in the book :

<i>Āśvalāyanaparīśiṣṭa</i> : fol. 3, 11, 220 & 241.	<i>(Svalpa) Kālaviveka</i> : 26 & 35.
<i>Kalpataru</i> : 63, 66, 105, 134, 152, 229, 235, 236, 237, 241 & 251 (12).	<i>Kṛtyapārtīhāta</i> : 243.
<i>Kāmadhenu</i> 14, 66, 97, 165 & 227	<i>Kṛtyasāgara</i> : 138.
<i>Kāmadhenuṭīkā</i> (by Gaṅgādhara): 97	Gaṅgādhara. 97 & 251
<i>Kāla-kaumudī</i> : 13, 18, 24, 28, 32, 37, 39, 58, 63, 65-68, 84, 88, 93, 97, 123, 127, 129, 131, 138, 142, 145-48, 150, 152, 158, 165, 170, 174 & 175 (40).	Guru (Prabhākara): 2 & 139.
<i>Kālaviveka</i> : 2, 14, 37, 82, 121, 142, 145-48.	Govindarāja: 20 & 234.
<i>Bṛhat-Kālaviveka</i> . 30 & 148.	<i>Gautamabhāṣya</i> : 32 & 39.
<i>Dākṣiṇātya-Kālaviveka</i> : 88.	<i>Chandogāhika</i> 69 & 73.
	Jayāditya: 15 & 247.
	<i>Jikanasamgraha</i> : 103.
	Jimūtavāhana: 18, 26, 34, 68, 71, 80, 84, 88, 97, 108-10, 122, 126, 144, 148, 152, 155, 158 & 164 (24).
	<i>Ṭikākāra</i> (on the <i>Mahābhārata</i>): 4.

6 R. L. Mitra. *Notices of Sans. Mss.*, vol. VI, pp. 243-44 (L. 2181). The Ms. goes upto the 17th canto. The India Office Ms. which is complete omits all the above verses except two half-verses at the end and also omits the important word 'Rājyadhara' in the colophon: Eggeling's *I. O. Cat.*, p. 1417 Verses 3 & 6 are found in the *Nirṇaya-Bṛhaspati* noticed below.

7 H. P. Śāstrī. *Darbar Lib. Cat.*, vol. I, pp. 254-55. The Ms. goes upto 6th canto only. Cf. also Eggeling, *op. cit.*, p. 1432 where the colophon reads:—

इति महिन्तापनीय-कविचक्रवर्ति-मिश्राचार्य-श्रीमद्रहस्यसिद्धि-शिशुपालबधविवेचने
निर्णयद्रहस्यतौ...

- Tiṭhinirṇaya* (by Bhavadeva): 34, 80, 113-14 & 150.
Tiṭhiviveka: 33, 36-37, 39, 113 & 148.
Tirabbukṭiyāḥ: 248.
Trailokyamohana-Pañcarātra: 245.
Divaspatisaṃhitā: 184.
Devabodha (Yājñavalkyaṭikā): 207.
Dhananīyaya: 16, 27, 28, 39, 60, 72, 74, 81, 94, 96-98, 102, 109, 111, 130, 132, 134, 143, 152, 155, 159, 165, 174, & 176 (28).
Dhavalasamgraha: 73.
Dhavalēśvarasamgraha: 32.
Dhīrasamgraha: 184.
Nigamaparīṣṭa: 243.
Nilakaṇṭha: 89 & 100.
Nilāmbarācārya: 37, 71, 97, 110, 112, 114, 132, 143 & 176.
Parīṣṭaṭikā: 149.
Parīṣṭaparakāśa: 57 & 243.
Pañcanārādīya: 13.
Patrāṅkura: 146 & 218.
Paśupati: 251.
Brahmagupta: 112 & 174.
Bhaṭṭapāda: 12.
Bhavadeva: 34-35, 39, 66, 82, 84, 102, 172 & 138 (11).
Bhānūpādhyāya: 5, 34, 63, 74, 132, 170, 194 & 223.
Bhānubhaṭṭa: 25 & 97.
Bhimopādhyāya: 139.
Bhojadeva: 71 & 83.
Bhojarāja: 170.
Bhojarājasamgraha: 151.
Lakṣmidhara: 32, 39 & 100.
Vardhamānopādhyāya: 21, 25, 225, 228, 239 & 240.
Varṣadīpikā: 96, 98, 103, 123, 126, 133 & 148.
Vārtikakāra: 13.
Vidhinibandha: 139 & 180.
Viṣṇupurāṇa-Ṭikākāra (Dakṣiṇadeśiya) 231.
Vedāntavācaspati: 65.
Śaṅkhaadhara: 20, 34, 66, 94, 127, 191, 141 & 227.
Śabdamaḥārṇava (?): 85.
Śuddhīdīpikā: 112.
Śrāddhapradīpa: 225, 228-29, 233, 237 & 239.
Śrāddhabandha (by Bhānūpādhyāya): 253.
Śrāddhabhāṣya (by Nilāmvara): 129, 240-41 & 253.
Śrāddhaviveka: 17, 19, 21, 23-26, 29, 55, 56, 57, 74, 98, 127, 130, 135, 136-37, 140, 143, 177, 224-25, 239-41, 247 & 251 (33).
Śrāddhasāra: 252.
Śrāddhoddyota: 171.
Śridatta: 69 & 73.
Śridharāṇika: 148.
Satya: 152.
Samayanirṇaya: 61, 79, 81, 85, 97, 112, 122, 167 & 175.
Samayaprakāśa: 5, 7, 16, 17, 22, 25-27, 29, 62-67, 72, 93, 127, 129, 131, 133, 137, 140-41, 148 & 149 (31).
Samayapradīpa: 13, 23, 29, 32, 37, 39, 63, 65, 67, 73, 78, 87-8, 92-3, 96, 110, 112, 128, 129, 134, 140, 148, 156, 158, 162, 165, 171, 175, 177, 179 & 184 (35).
Samvatsarapradīpa: 22, 81-2, 88, 100, 101, 103, 112, 119, 123, 134, 143, 144, 148-9, 154, 166, 169, 175-77, 179 & 241 (27).
Pāścātya-Samvatsarapradīpa: 107, 121, 129.
Brhat-Samvatsarapradīpa: 82 & 147.
Svalpa-Samvatsarapradīpa: 68, 70, 72, 81, 95, 129, 172.
Sārasamuccaya: 120.
Sūrisantoṣa: 60, 88-9, 103, 142-43, 153 & 239.
Somapaddhati: 183.

<i>Smṛtikaumudī</i> : 245.	87-8, 122-3, 153, 174, 176, 177, 182 & 218.
<i>Smṛtiparibhāṣā</i> : 25 & 87.	
<i>Smṛtiprakāśakāra</i> : 29 & 39.	<i>Svalpa-Smṛtisamuccaya</i> : 18, 65, 103, 122, 148, 154 & 184.
<i>Smṛtimañjari</i> : 196.	<i>Smṛtisārasamuccaya</i> : 87, 127 & 148.
<i>Smṛtimabhāṣya</i> : 61, 84-5, 88, 93, 120 & 123.	<i>Svalpa-Smṛtisārasamuccaya</i> : 132.
<i>Smṛtimimāṃsā</i> : 76-77.	<i>Smṛtisiddhapañjikā</i> : 149 & 150.
<i>Smṛtiratnamālā</i> : 5, 54, 193, 202, 204, 208, 210, 216, 218 & 220.	<i>Halāyudha</i> : 243 & 251.
<i>Smṛtiratnākara</i> : 192.	<i>Hāratalā</i> : 202, 218 & 222.
<i>Smṛtīsamuccaya</i> : 14, 32, 39, 78, 80-1,	<i>Hemādri</i> : 40, 58, 60-1, 66, 69, 70-1, 77, 81, 98, 114, 148, 150-1, 156, 178 & 179 (20).

The Ms. comes to an end abruptly in the midst of the *third* part of the book, relating to *Śrāddha*, which begins at fol. 224b with the following headline:—

अथेदानीमस्मिन् स्मृतिरत्नहारे प्राप्तावसरस्तृतीयः श्राद्धबन्धः कर्तुमारभ्यते ।

The second part (on *Asauca*) similarly begins on fol. 188a with the heading:—

अथेदानीं प्राप्तावसरो द्वितीयो निबन्धो कर्तुमारभ्यते ।

The first part which is a long one relates to *Kāla*, including the most favourite topic of Indian writers the roll of religious ceremonies to be performed in each *Tithi* and month. Towards the end of this part (in fol. 186) there is an astronomical table for the calculation of *Lagnamāna*.

The earliest writers to quote from a *Smṛti* work of Rāyamukuta were Haridāsa Tarkācārya* (fl. in the 1st quarter of the 16th century A.D.) and next to him Raghunandana.⁹ But the Kāmarūpa scholar Pītāmbara Siddhān-

8 There are four references to Rāyamukuta in the *Śrāddhamṛṇaya* of Haridāsa (fol. 17, 57 as from 'Mukutarāya', 90 & 99 of *Smṛti* Ms. No. 236 belonging to the Saṃskṛta Sāhitya Pariṣad, Calcutta); one in the *Śrāddhāvivekaṭikā* (fol. 37 of Sans. Ms. No. 1591 of Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣad) and two under the title 'Mukutarāya' in his *Asaucaṇibandha* (fol. 2 & 13 of Ms. No. 977 of the Anglo-Sanskrit Library, Navadvīpa). Haridāsa wrote soon after 1503 A.D. (*IHQ.*, vol. XVI, p. 61). None of these quotations can be traced in the present fragment of Rāyamukuta.

9 For references to Rāyamukuta in the works of Raghunandana *vide* *JASB.*, 1915, p. 371. The following passage of the present work has been cited almost *verbatim* under the name Rāyamukuta in the *Śrāddhatattva* (Vaṅgavāsī Ed., 1316 B.E., p. 120):—

उत्तरतो वामपार्श्वे इत्यर्थः, 'उत्तरे चास्य सौवर्णं लक्ष्म पार्श्वे भविष्यतीति महाभारत दर्शनादुत्तरशब्दस्य वामवचनता। स च सदाचाराद्भोक्तेरेवेति पशुपतिः। उपविष्ट-

tavāgīśa cited in the *Śrāddhakaumudī*,¹⁰ as many as 26 passages, and most of these quotations are traceable in the present work. This dismisses a possible argument that Bṛhaspati Miśra might have been different from Rāyamukuta. It appears that though the work was composed long before the author earned the title Rāyamukuta he was widely known by the latter title ever afterwards.

An examination of this list will show that the book, though a fragment, throws light on many a problem on the medieval history of the Dharmaśāstra. A few remarkable instances are briefly stated below. The *Kālakaumudī*, whose authorship is yet unknown, claims the largest number of references (40). There are reasons to believe that it is a long lost work of the Bengal school.¹¹ A *Svalpa-Kālaviveka* (probably by Śūlapāṇi) has been distinguished from the *Kālaviveka* of Jimūtavāhana as well as the *Dākṣiṇātya-Kālaviveka* (of Mādhava). The *Tuṭhimirṇaya*, definitely ascribed to the famous Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa, is one of the long forgotten works of the

ब्राह्मणानामुत्तरस्यां दिशीति कल्पतरुः, ब्राह्मणानां वामपार्श्व इति हलायुधः । आह्वया-
तात् कर्तुः सन्निहि(त)स्यैव वामपार्श्व इति आह्वयविवेकः । तदेव युक्तन्तथा च “या
दक्षिणा सा प्राची या पूर्वा सोत्तरे”ति पित्रा इष्टमुपक(म्य) ब्राह्मण(ं) प्राचीति गङ्गाधरः ।
कर्तुश्च स्वस्य वामपार्श्वमुत्तरा दिगिति सा च सर्व्वेषां यथोक्तधृतैः भोक्तृब्राह्मणानामपि सोत्तरा
दिशेवेति कल्पतरुः कथा सहैकवाक्यतयापि सिद्धा । (fol. 251)

10 *Śrāddhakaumudī* (Ed. Tārānātha Gosvāmi of Gauripur, Assam, 1850 \$.) pp. 3, 6, 8-11, 15-6, 19-20, 27, 30-1, 39, 48, 58, 63, 65, 72, 79, 85, 87, 101, 104 & 145-46. The passage on p. 8 occurs in fol. 244b of the present Ms., that on p. 9 in fol. 246a; on p. 15 in fol. 246b, on p. 20 in fol. 246a and that on p. 48 in fol. 252a. Siddhāntavāgīśa flourished under Naranārāyaṇa and Sukladhvaja of Kāmarūpa late in the 16th cent. A.D. and finally settled at Darrang under Raghudeva, son of Sukladhvaja. One of his works the *Dāyakaumudī* (Ed., 1826 Śaka, Gauripur, Assam) was written in 1526 Śaka (1604 A.D.). On p. 104-5 of the *Śrāddhakaumudī* views of a scholar ('kaścit') are cited and refuted; the passage cited is from the *Śrāddhataṭṭva* (op. cit., p. 412). Similarly a passage from p. 481 of the *Śrāddhataṭṭva* is found cited in p. 195 of the *Śrāddhakaumudī* as of 'kaścit'. Siddhāntavāgīśa is thus one of the earliest writers to refer to Raghunandana.

11 The *Rāmaprakāśa* of Rājā Kṛpārāma (cf. *IHQ.*, XXVII, pp. 6-10) refers to it in one place as 'Gauḍiyya-Kālakaumudyām' (fol. 327a of the Ms. copy preserved in the Edward VII Anglo-Sanskrit Library at Navadvīpa). The *Rāmaprakāśa*, being written outside Bengal, similarly refers even to a work of Raghunandana as '*Gauḍagrānta-Tuṭhitattva*' (fol. 356a).

latter.¹² The *Smṛtimabhārṇava*, so frequently quoted by medieval scholars, has been ascribed to Bhojadeva.¹³ There were at least two works of the names of *Samvatsarapradīpa* and *Dhanāñjaya*, one of the most favourite authors of Rāyamukūṭa, is stated to be the author of one of them. Two rare passages of a *Smṛtiprakāśakāra* have been preserved; these are:—

(i) “स्मृतिप्रकाशकारस्तु मेधादिच्छन्नस्यापि निमित्तत्वमाह प्रासावच्छिन्नकालस्य गणितप्रमितत्वात् दर्शनपदस्य च तदुपलक्षणत्वात्.....” (fol. 63a)

(ii) “स्मृतिप्रकाशकारस्तु दर्शा(भाव)स्ययोर्विकल्पमाह” (fol. 29a)

These two very passages have been also cited by numerous medieval scholars, notably Upādhyāyas Śrīdatta, Harinātha and Vardhamāna of Mithila, under the name ‘Harihara Miśra’.¹⁴ This Harihara is generally taken to be identical with Agnihotrī Harihara, the famous author of the *Pāraskarabhāṣya*, though not a single quotation of Śrīdatta and others can be traced therein. On the present evidence of Rāyamukūṭa it is evident that it was from the *Smṛtiprakāśa* of Harihara Miśra (probably different from Agnihotrī Harihara) that the Maithila writers frequently cited.¹⁵

Rāyamukūṭa has quoted from two works of Vardhamānopādhyāya—the *Smṛtiparibhāṣā* and the *Śrāddhahapradīpa*. This Vardhamāna, who was wrongly identified by the late Mr. M. M. Chakravarti with *Navya*-Vardhamāna of the late 15th cent. A.D., seems really to be the famous

12 तथा च तिथिनिर्णये भवदेवेन ‘यां तिथिं समनुप्राप्य उदयं याति भास्कर’ इति, दैवे कर्मणि संप्राप्ते यस्यामभ्युदितो रविरित्यादि लिखित्वोक्तं..... (fol. 150^b)

Also: भवदेवेनापि तिथिनिर्णये उक्तं (fol. 34^a)

13 “स्मृतिमहार्णवे भोजदेवः” (fol. 84a) “स्मृतिमहार्णवे भोजराजलिखितं वचनं” (fol. 120^b)

14 Passage (i) occurs in Śrīdatta’s *Samayapradīpa* (fol. 53b of Govt. Ms. No. 10619 preserved in the R.A.S.B.) in Harinātha’s *Smṛtisāra* (p. 66 of Ms. No. II. A. 40 of the R.A.S.B.) and in Vardhamāna’s *Smṛtiparibhāṣā* (fol. 20a of Ms. No. 5460 of the R.A.S.B.), each under the name of Harihara, the title ‘Miśra’ being added after the name by Vardhamāna. There is a remarkable similarity in language and argument in all the three works here and elsewhere. Passage (ii) occurs in Harinātha (*loc. cit.*, p. 68) and Vardhamāna (*loc. cit.*, fol. 31b).

15 Śrīdatta cites ten times from Harihara in his *Ācārādarsa* (Litho. Ed., Benares, 1939 V.S. pp. 8, 10 etc.), Harinātha six times (*loc. cit.*, pp. 17, 47, 49, 66, & 68 of *Ācāra* and p. 75 of *Vivāda*) and Vardhamāna 4 times, but none of these passages can be traced in *Pāraskarabhāṣya*.

Naiyāyika, son of Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya. The late Dr. H. P. Śāstrī wrongly described him as a third Vardhamāna, son of Caṇḍeśvara.¹⁶

Date of the *Smṛti-ratnabāra*

The only reference, however, which has a bearing on the date of the work, is to the well-known works of Śūlapāṇi: the *Śrāddhāviveka* and *Tīthiviveka*. The former happens to be the most frequently cited work next to the *Kāla-kaumudī* and the *Samaya-pradīpa*. The late Mr. M. M. Cakravartī practically said the last word on the date of Śūlapāṇi, who 'flourished in the beginning of the 15th cent. A.D., if not earlier'.¹⁷ Śūlapāṇi cited the *Kāla-Mādhaviya* and was himself cited by Rudradhara and Vācaspati Miśra. But it escaped the learned scholar's notice that Śūlapāṇi lived to refute the views of Vācaspati Miśra in one of his last works the *Rāsayātrāviveka*. The passages are given below:—¹⁸

(i) एतद्वचनं हि तीर्थचिन्तामणौ धृतं व्याख्यातम् । अत्र कृत्तिकानक्षत्रयोगेन यन्महा-
कार्तिक्यभिधानं तीर्थचिन्तामणौ वाचस्पतिमिश्रेणाभिहितं तद्वैयमेव कृत्तिकारोहिण्यन्यतर-
नक्षत्रेणैव सम्भवात् । तथाहि भोजराजधृतं वचनं 'कार्तिके पोषमास्यान्तु...' (fol. 2a)

(ii) ब्रह्मपुराणे...तदा कुर्वीत विधिवत्प्रतिष्ठां पापनाशिनी । प्रतिष्ठा स्थापनं, तीर्थचिन्तामणा-
वप्येवं । (fol. 4a).

16 स्मृतिपरिभाषायां वर्द्धमानोपाध्यायः (fol. 25a) श्राद्धप्रदीपे वर्द्धमानोपाध्यायोक्तिः (239^b)

The references on fol. 21b & 25a are from the *Paribhāṣā* (fol. 13-14), vide *JASB.*, 1915, pp. 401-3. In the *Descr. Cat. of Sans. Mss.* Govt. Collection, RASB., vol. III, p. 840 Dr. Śāstrī was clearly wrong in reading the name as 'Caṇḍeśvara' in the 2nd introductory verse of the *Smṛtiparibhāṣā*; the verse, which was added in the margin, reads:—

न्यायाम्भोजपतञ्जाय मीमांसापारदखने । गंगेश्वराय गुरवे पितृस्त्र(भवते) नमः ॥

The fact that the printed edition of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* does not contain third introductory verse of the *Kusumāñjaliprakāśa*

17 *JASB.*, 1915, p. 342. The passage from the *Kālamādhaviya* (B.I. Ed. p. 80) occurs in the *Durgotsavāviveka* (Sans. Sahitya Pariśad Ed., Calcutta, p. 4). The *Kālamādhaviya* was written sometime after 1359 A.D., when in the *Vikāri* year a malamāsa occurred as stated in the book (p. 70-1).

According to commentators (cf. fol. 22a of a *Dvaitanirṇaya-tippaṇi*, Ms. in the V. R. Museum, Rajshahi; also, fol. 22b of Vāgiśa's *Dvaitanirṇayadīpikā*—Ms. No. 151D of the Dacca University) Vācaspati refers in his *Dvaitanirṇaya* to the views of Rudradhara and the '*Gauḍiya-Śrāddhāviveka*' is cited (*Śrāddhāviveka* p. 50 of the Chowkh. Ed.) by the latter. So all the three great scholars Śūlapāṇi, Rudradhara and Vācaspati Miśra were more or less contemporaries. Vācaspati wrote about c. 1440-70 A.D. under the Mithila kings Bhairava and his son Rāmabhadra.

The fact that the printed edition of the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* does not contain any of the two short notes cited above only deepens the problem and should be regarded in our opinion as going in favour of and not against the genuineness of the *Rāsayaṭrāviveka*, which bears all the stamp of the smaller tracts of Śūlapāṇi, specially the sister work *Dolayātrāviveka*. Śūlapāṇi, therefore, cannot have written this text before the sixties of the 15th cent. A.D., and the earliest date for his major works like the *Śrāddhāviveka* would be the decade 1420-30 A.D. The date of the present *Smṛti* work of Rāyamukūṭa is thus fixed to be *circa* 1440 A.D., and not certainly before 1430 A.D.

The Padacandrikā

The subsequent career of Rāyamukūṭa finds a glowing description in the introduction to his *magnum opus* the *Padacandrikā* commentary on the *Amarakoṣa*. The whole of this valuable introduction though printed several times is reproduced below.¹⁹

अध्यास्ते यः सर्वो ध्रुव ईदृश इत्यगोचरो वचसः ।
 अहमिति संविद्विषयः पुरुषः स परः पुरातनो जयति ॥१
 हेतुर्महतः सूक्ष्मा सत्यपि जगदुपरि गौरवं यस्याः ।
 श्रुतिपथे नवप्रतिभाशक्तिः सा किल करोतु मे कुशलम् ॥२
 श्रीवत्सलाञ्छनपदद्वयपद्मशृङ्गाद् गङ्गापयोऽन्वहविगाहनहीनपङ्कात् ।
 मायाप्रतिग्रहनिवर्तनसत्प्रतिज्ञाद् गोविन्दनामजनकाब्जनकाशुकारात् ॥३
 भर्तृव्रतागणशिरोमणितां गतायाः सीमन्तिनीगणशतैरपि नन्दितायाः ।
 दानव्रतौघविधिसाधितकीर्त्तिसीम्नो मातुश्च शीलव्रतनीलसुखायीदेव्याः ॥४
 योऽभूद् यस्य च योषिदद्भुतगुणा भूयो रमा निर्वृता
 धत्ते यः कविचक्रवर्त्तिपद्मप्याचार्यवर्यश्च यः ।
 राढायामपि गाढनिर्मलकुलच्छत्रं कुलीनाग्रणी-
 र्यः प्राप्त प्रणतः परं हरिपदद्वन्द्वारविन्दे च यः ॥५

18 We have got two Ms. copies of the book in our possession, complete in fol. 3 & 4. There are references to Nārāyaṇa Upādhyāya (once), the *Utkalalalikā* (twice) and the *Pratisthāviveka*. It begins:—

नत्वा कृष्णपदद्वन्द्वं सुराणामपि सेवितं । विवेको रासयान्नायाः क्रियते शूलपाणिना ॥

19 Vide A. Borooah's Ed. of *Amarakoṣa*, pt. I (1887), p. 2; Eggeling: *Ind. Off. Cat.*, pp. 270-71. Introd. to the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, Ed. V.R.S. Rajshahi, pp. 20-21. There are slight variations in the reading of the verses and we have tried to give the best possible version above. Most of the verses are sometimes omitted in Ms. copies. Cf. *Des. Cat. of Sans. Mss.*, Cal. Sans. Coll., vol. vii, lex., p. 12-3.

ज्योतिष्मन्मणिपुञ्जमञ्जुलरुचं हारं ज्वलत्कुण्डले
 रत्नौघच्छुरिता दशाङ्गुलिजुषः शोचिष्मतीरुर्मिकाः ।
 यः प्राप्य द्विरदोषविष्टकनकलानैरविन्दन् वृषा-
 च्छलेतैस्तुरगैश्च रायमुकुटाभिख्यामभिख्यावतीम् ॥ ६
 यत्पुला नृपमन्त्रिमांलिमणयो विश्वासरायादयः
 ख्याता दिग्जयिनामपीह जयिनो लोके क्वीन्द्राश्च ये ।
 ब्रह्माण्डामरपादपादिसहितं येऽदुस्तुलापूरुषं
 तत्तद्गन्धविशेषनिर्मितकृतः कृत्स्नेषु शास्त्रेषु ते ॥ ७
 पुरयां पण्डितसार्वभौमपदवीं गौडावनीवासवाद्-
 यः प्राप्तः प्रथितो बृहस्पतिरिति क्षमालोकवाचस्पतिः ।
 कोषस्यामरनिर्मितस्य विविधव्याख्यानदीक्षागुरुः
 सानन्दं पदचन्द्रिकां स कुरुते टीकामिमां कीर्त्तये ॥ ८
 इयं षोडशटीकार्थसारमादाय निर्मिता ।
 अतोऽभिलिखितोऽर्थोऽस्यां न हेयः सहसा वुधैः ॥ ९
 अदसीयार्थहरणाद् यो मन्त्रमापनेष्यति ।
 तमेतत्कृतिनो दुःखशिखी धक्ष्यति सान्वयम् ॥ १०

Verses 3-5 substantially agrees with the account given in the earlier works.²⁰ It is stated in the commentaries on the *Raghu* and *Māgha* that he had already received, evidently through the graces of his patron Rājyadhara, high honours at the court of the Gauda king, which was followed up by much greater and newer laurels so eloquently related for the first time in vv. 6-8 above, culminating in the elevation of his sons to the highest rank of royal ministers. The title 'Rāyamukuta' seems to suggest that during this period Brhaspati himself exchanged for sometime at least his literary profession for a political career which secured for his sons a position exactly equal to what was enjoyed by his former patron Rāya Rājyadhara, as a comparison of v. 7 above with vv. 5-6 of the *Smṛti-ratnahāra* will bear out.²¹ There is

20 In L. 2181 the name of the mother recorded in the line सुकृतिनीह मथायिनाम्नी' has been corrected after the *Padacandrikā*; the name of the wife on the other hand was 'निवृत्ता' and not 'रमा' on the evidence of the *Raghuṭīkā*.

21 We have accepted the reading of the Rajshahi Ms. in the name of Rāya-mukuta's son "विश्वासराय" whom we take to be identical with the patron of Arjuna Miśra:

“गौडेश्वरमहामन्त्रिभोमद्विश्वासरायतः । लब्धानुज्ञेन लिखिता मोक्षधर्मार्थदीपिका ॥

(H. P. Śāstri: *Notices*, vol. IV, No. 295—Ms. dated 1456 Śaka).

no doubt that the *Padacandrikā* was written at a very advanced age of the author when his sons had already reached the peak of their fortunes and this is amply borne out by the long array of his numerous titles of distinction so scrupulously recorded in the colophon to all available copies of this work. His academic title 'Mīśra' is now dropped and in addition to the family title 'Mahintāpanīya' and the first honorary title 'Kavicakravartī' (conferred by Rājyadhara) the new ones are used (in their chronological order) as follows—'Rājapaṇḍita' 'Paṇḍitasārvabhauma', '(Kavi-) Paṇḍita-cūḍāmaṇi', 'Mahācārya' and 'Rāyamukutaṃaṇi'. None of these five titles are ever mentioned in the earlier works, while the original 'Ācārya' has given place to the bigger title 'Mahācārya'. The conclusion is, therefore, irresistible that a long period of time separated his earlier works from this last work the *Padacandrikā*. If the date of the *Smṛti-ratnahāra* is fixed at c. 1440 A.D. the *Padacandrikā* will have to be placed three decades later in about 1470 A.D. The presumption that the book was composed in 1431 A.D. from the incidental mention of that date in the body of the book appears thus to be wholly wrong.

There is an old complete copy of the *Padacandrikā* preserved in the V. R. Museum, Rajshahi (Ms. No. 650) of which the colophon runs as follows:—

“इति महिन्तापनीय-कविचक्रवर्ति-राजपरिडित-परिडितसार्वभौम-परितचूडामणि-महाचार्य
रायमुकुटश्रीमद्वृहस्पतिकृतायाममर-कोषपञ्जिकायां पदचन्द्रिकायां लिङ्गादिसंग्रहवर्गः समाप्तः
समाप्ता चेत्यमरकोषपञ्जिकेति ॥ श्रीः १३६६ भगवते नमः ॥”

This laconic mention of a figure '1396' left us in doubt whether it was the date of the transcript (which being on paper does not look so old) or of the original from which it was copied. All speculation is now set at rest by the examination of another copy of the last part of the *Padacandrikā* recently acquired by the same museum (Ms. No. 1985) where that date 1396 Saka is clearly recorded as that of the composition of the *Padacandrikā* itself. This unique Ms. copy of the book ends as follows:—

सेनानोबदनप्रहामिविधुभिः शाक्रे मिते हायने
शुक्रे मास्यसिते दिनाधिपतिथौ सौरेहि मध्यन्दिने ।
सद्यः संशयसञ्चयापचयकृद्दृष्ट्याख्याविशेषोज्ज्वला
पर्याप्ता पदचन्द्रिकाभवदियं संरक्षणीया बुधैः ॥
यावच्चुम्बति विम्बमम्बरमयोः प्राच्यप्रतीच्याचलौ
यावन्मण्डलमेन्दवं यति तमस्काण्डं जगन्मण्डनं ।

यावज्जहसुताम्बुधेरनुभवत्याल्लेषलीलासुखं
 तावन्मे कृतिरातनोतु कृतिनामानन्दवन्दो(द)यं ॥
 यावच्चन्द्ररुचिश्चक्रोरनिचयैश्चञ्चूभिराचम्यते
 यावच्चण्डरुचो रुचः परिचयाच्छुक्रः शुचं सुचति ।
 यावच्चुम्बति साचलाग्धिरचला चको(श)चूडामियं
 तावच्चारुविचाराणाभिरचिता टीका चकास्तूचकैः ॥ श्रीः
 समाप्ता चेयममरकोषपञ्जिकेति । शुभमस्तु शकाब्दाः १६०१ ॥
 ओं नमो नारायणाय ओं नमोऽस्तु तस्मै जगदीश्वराय ।
 श्रीरामजीवनदेवशर्मणः पुस्तकमिदं स्वाक्षरैश्च तस्य ।
 अहं.....यो मूढः इदं पुस्तकं मया लिखितं.....ण
 पुस्तकमिदमिति गदति तस्य गोवधव्रणवधफलम् ।
 सङ्क्षेपज्ञातं गुणकोटिनम्रं यश.....क्षत्रियसव्यहस्ता ।
 पर परप्राणहरोप...सपक्षयोगाद...यो गरीयान् ॥ (fol. 163).

The book was finished, therefore, in 1396 Śaka in the month of Jyaiṣṭha on the 12th day of the dark fortnight being a Saturday; the date works out to be June 11, 1474 A.D. The two prayer verses at the end are fine specimens of alliteration. It now becomes difficult to explain why the author had chosen a much earlier date (1353 Śaka) for incidental mention in the body of the book. That date, we believe, is the record of an important event witnessed by the author (e.g., the death of Sultan Jalaluddin) or it might have been borrowed from an earlier commentator without acknowledgement. One of the commentaries most frequently cited by Rāyamukuta was the 'Kaumudī', which one would be tempted to identify with the *Kaumudī* of Nayanānanda, who, as the late Mr. Borooah found out, mentioned the same date in the very language of Rāyamukuta without indicating his source. But Nayanānanda is evidently a much later author as he quotes from Ramānātha (of the Kalāpa school).²² His work requires, however, to be carefully examined.

22 A passage in the 'kālavarga' of the *Amarakoṣa* (I. iii. 21) is explained by a few commentators by referring to an actual year of the Śaka era corresponding to the Kaliyuga year. Mr. Borooah (*loc. cit.* p. 145) discovered three other commentaries, besides Rāyamukuta (p. 144), where a date is recorded. Of them Rāmanātha definitely states:—४७३४ अस्मिन् कल्यन्दे एतत्शास्त्रं कृतं श्रीरामनाथविद्यावाचस्पतिभट्टाचार्येण" (=1633 A.D.). The year (1353 Śaka) mentioned by Nayanānanda is evidently borrowed from Rāyamukuta as Mr. Borooah remarked. Nayanānanda quotes *Sarvavarmā* (p. 14), a commentary 'Sarvānnavādini' (p. 15) and Ramānātha:—"अर्द्ध गतौ याचने च, चकाराद् हिंसायां चेति गणवृत्तौ रमानाथः" (p. 32). Evidently he belonged to the Kalāpa

The late Mr. Borooah had rightly chosen the *Padacandrikā*, along with the commentary of Kṣīrasvāmī for publication in his projected edition of the *Amarakoṣa* which stopped with his untimely death. But while Kṣīrasvāmī's commentary has appeared in print in more than one edition, Rāyamukūṭa failed to secure another publisher for over half a century. The *Padacandrikā* bristles with quotations from a very large number of works on various subjects and though Aufrecht published a list of the authorities cited therein long ago,²³ a thorough examination of the book is yet to be attempted and is bound to repay amply the labours of any young scholar (from Bengal).

The *Padacandrikā* is expressly based on sixteen previous commentaries on the *Amarakoṣa* most of which are now lost. Their names will have to be selected from the following list. (The figures against each name indicate the number of times the word occurs in the printed portion of the book—A. Borooah's ed., 2 pts., 176 pp. up to I. V. 5).

Kaliṅga (12)	<i>Madbumādbavī</i> or <i>Mādbavī</i> (6)
Kokkaṭa	<i>Vyākhyāmṛta</i> (1) p. 55
<i>Kaumudī</i> (56)	Śrīkara
Kṣīrasvāmī, also referred to as Svāmī, Bhaṭṭa or Bhaṭṭasvāmī, cited almost on every page.	Śrīdhara (5) pp. 34, 65, 73, 114 & 119.
Jātarūpa	Sarvadhara (12)
Jātoka (2) pp. 128 & 139	Sarvānanda (15)
<i>Pañjikā</i> (5)	Subhūti (7)
Rājadeva (4) pp. 13, 15 & 87	Somanandī (2) p. 125 & 148.
Rāmadāsa (1) p. 71	Haḍḍacandra (4) pp. 40, 77, 96 & 118

school. The well known date of Sarvānanda, 1081 Śaka, was also given by Mr. Borooah from a Ms. copy of his commentary in his own possession and he quite correctly remarked that it was the date of Śrinivāsa (and not of Sarvānanda):

“श्रीनिवासस्यैवार्यं समयः ।” Ever since the late Dr. G. Śāstri confused this date of Śrinivāsa with the date of composition of Sarvānanda's commentary, scholar after scholar has blindly followed him without realising the absurdity of the inference that both of them were writing simultaneously on the same table. Sarvānanda certainly wrote after 1081 Śaka, but how long after one cannot definitely state. Rāyamukūṭa had written 43 years after the date he actually mentioned. To the above list we should add the date 1540 Śaka (1618 A. D.) mentioned by Nārāyaṇa, author of the *Padārthakaumudī* (Eggeling: I.O. Cat. p. 278).

Kokkata, Jātarūpa and Śrīkara are cited in the subsequent portion of the commentary.²¹ Five among them—Kaliṅga, Jātarūpa, Rāmadāsa, Somanandī and Haḍḍacandra—preceded Sarvānanda who names them. Deveśvara and Sanātana, unless the latter is identical with the reviser of Sarvānanda's book, are two other names found in the latter but not cited by Rāyamukūṭa.

Next to Kṣīrasvāmī the *Kaumudī* is the most frequently cited and one of the latest commentaries tapped by Rāyamukūṭa and the quotations prove that Rāyamukūṭa was greatly indebted to it. As a typical instance of the wealth of quotations that the *Padacandrikā*, like its sister work the *Smṛti-ratnahāra*,²² possesses, let us cite one passage (p. 156):

पूर्वस्य चित्तस्य सन्तानद्वारेण स्थैर्यमाभोगइति भट्टः, आभोगस्तात्पर्यमिति सर्वानन्दः, व्यापार इति मधुमाधव्यादौ, अनागतचिन्तारूपचित्ताभोगो मनस्कार इति तु कोमुदो, एकस्मिन् विषये पुनः पुनश्चित्तवृत्तिराभोग इति तु पञ्जिका ।

The book throws a flood of light on many problems of the history of Sanskrit lexicography and grammar and we can only give here a few extracts pointing to the great value of the work, taken at random from the portion we have examined.

यद्यपि काव्यप्रदीपेऽमुह्यार्थ इति नाम्नो दोषस्य अयमुदयति मुद्राभञ्जन इत्युदाहरण-मुपन्यस्तं तथापि निरतुरोषमुह्यपदार्थाभावेऽमुह्यार्थ इत्यवधेयं । (p. 6).

This *Kāvya-pradīpa* is different from the well-known work of Govinda Ṭhakkura.

यत्तु दिद्याशीलोऽसिचिधौ 'दिविभुजिभ्यां विश्वे' (Un. IV. 237) इति पठित्वा विश्वे इति सप्तम्या अलुकि दिव्यतेरसि विश्वेदेवा इति सान्तमुदाजहार स तस्य विपर्यय-स्तद्वशोदोषेण हस्तामर्षं तलैव पारायणपरायणौ गौवर्द्धन-दामोदर-पुरुषोत्तमादिभिर्विदिभुजिभ्यां विश्वे इति वृत्तिं पठित्वा विश्वं वेत्ति विश्वेदेवा इति 'अश्रुषुषी'ति (Un. I. 15) कनूचिधौ विश्वं जगत् विश्वेदेवा इत्युदाहृतत्वादिति । p. 18.

24 We examined with the kind permission of the Vāṅgiya Sāhitya Paṇḍitā a fragment of the *Padacandrikā* (Sans. Ms. No. 229) which goes up to the end of the 'Vānaśadhivarga.' On fol. 62a we find "वयन्तु, क्षीरस्वामि-हृद्बन्ध-कोकटादौ दृष्टवन्तः" Also, कलिङ्गजातरूपौ...आहतुः (citing *Ratnakosādi*, fol. 87b) and Śrīkara on fol. 132b & 135b. This Śrīkara may be identical with the author of the *Vyākhyāmṛta*.

25 We forgot to mention before that in one place in the *Smṛti-ratnahāra* Rāyamukūṭa tagged together as many as 12 names in a single passage:—

...मूलयुक्तपूर्वदिने पत्नीप्रवेशनिषेधो वाच्यो हेमाद्रि-जोमतवाहन-कालविवेक-सूरिसन्तोष-कालकौमुदी-तिथिविवेक-श्रीधरादिक-बृहत्कालविवेक-स्मृतिसारसमुच्चय-समयप्रदीप-समयप्रकाश-वर्षदीपिका-संवत्सरप्रदीपादिकारैस्तत्काललिखितत्वेनानयो(र) मूलस्त्वप्रतोतेः । (fol. 148a).

पाण्डुगुणयोगात् 'नगपाण्डुपांशुभ्यः' इति रः । अस्यानार्षत्वात् पाण्डुरोऽसाधुरिति भागवृत्तिकृतो दुर्ज्ञानं जयादित्यं प्रति वाम्यमात्रजनितं । भाष्यविरुद्धं हि चेदं न त्वयुक्तं वृद्धान्तरोक्तानामन्येषामपि ग्राह्यत्वात्, भाष्यानुक्तानां भट्टिकोक्तानामन्यथाऽप्रामाण्यापत्तेः । अथ च शब्दार्थविकारादिभिराप परमशिष्टैरनुशिष्टः । 18.

(p. 166, also fol. 58a of Vañg. Sāh. Par. Ms.).

This interesting passage throws a side-light on the relation of the lost *Bhāgavṛtti* with the *Kāśikā* and expresses Rāyamukūṭa's obvious leaning towards lexicographic authorities.

ननु यदि पूर्वसमुद्रावधिरार्यावर्तः तदा गङ्गायाः पूर्वकूलमपि स्यात् नैवं, पूर्वं किल देवीकोटसमीपे पश्चिमे पूर्वोदधिरासीत् तदपेक्ष्य उक्तमिति स्वामी ।

(fol. 98b of the Vañgiya Sāhitya Paṛiṣad Ms.).

Rāyamukūṭa belongs to the *Mahintāpanīya* family as stated by himself; this is a well known family of the Rāḍhīya Brahmins now called the *Mahintā*. Śrīnivāsa, the famous author of the *Suddhidīpikā* and the *Gaṇitā-cūḍāmaṇi* also belonged to this family as stated by Rāyamukūṭa (p. 144); the family seemed to have continued to enjoy royal patronage from the times of Vallālasena down to Pathan times.

DINESH CHANDRA BHATTACHARYYA

The *Āṅgacūliya*, a sacred text of the Jainas

Critical Apparatus

Besides the well-known Jaina canonical texts, the present study is based on a special investigation of the following material, viz.,

- (i) A—The *Āṅgacūliya*. This work deals, as will be found from its detailed examination below, with the incidence of heresy, a topic which leads to prescriptions regarding the proper observance of rites connected with admission into the Order, ceremonies of ordination of different grades of seniority, and study of the sacred scriptures. According to the traditional lists of texts to be studied by a Jaina ascetic, this text is treated as *āṅga-bāhira* i.e., one outside the *Āṅga* texts.¹ It is composed in Prakrit except a single sentence in Sanskrit prose and the quoted Sanskrit verses—items to which we shall have occasion later on to refer. Three versions of this text have been used for the present study, viz.,

AB—Ms. orient. fol. no. 2565 in the *Preussische Staatsbibliothek*, Berlin. Though legibly written, this Ms. is full of mistakes, with frequent confusion of letters, omission of words and clauses, and repetitions. The Ms. bears no dates.

AP—Ms. in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, as no. 1160 of 1884-87 (cf. Bhandarkar's *Report*, for those years, p. 110). This Ms. was examined in Poona by Professor Schubring in December 1927, who compared it with his copy of AB previously made. To judge from the notes kept by Prof. Schubring of this comparison, which were available to the present writer during 1938-39 when he worked with Prof. Schubring in Hamburg University, this Ms. closely agrees with AB and the few variants that occur here and there are not worth taking serious notice of. Fols. 1 and 15 are missing, and

¹ Nandī, p. 202A; Āṇuog. p. 6A. See also Schubring, *Die Lehre der Jainas* (Grundriss), p. 55f. In all matters concerning Jaina dogmatics, I have contented myself in the following pages with referring to Schubring's *Lehre* which is the latest authoritative work on the subject.

the leaf marked no. 1 does not belong to this text. At the end a later hand has added the date samvat 1607 (thus furnishing a *terminus ante quem* of the main script) as well as some other notices.

AS—Ms. no. 4462 (entry no. 377, under which it was mentioned by Leumann)² in the *Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire*, Strasbourg, of which a photographic reproduction was made by the Library and supplied to the present writer. It shows that the script is evidently more modern than that of AB and that the copying is more correct. There is no mention of dates by the scribe. Apart from a not uninteresting difference, the significance of which will be fully discussed later on, there are no very important variants in this from AB or AP. A few extracts from this Ms. made by Leumann are preserved among his papers inherited by the *Seminar für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens* of the University of Hamburg. These extracts proved to be of little use for our present purposes.

- (ii) Āv—*The Āvassayanijutti*, Ms. orient. fol. no. 692 in the *Preuss. Staatsbib.*, Berlin. This work forms the second Mūlasutta of the Jaina canon.³
- (iii) Āv—*The Āvaśyakavṛtti*, Ms. or. fol. no. 763 in the *Preuss. Staatsbib.*, Berlin, which is a commentary on Āv by Haribhadra (c. 750 A.C.).⁴
- (iv) Āy—*The Āyāraṇi*, a text belonging to the class of later non-canonical texts known as Sāmāyārī or "Rules of Conduct."⁵ This work is composed in Prakrit intermingled with Sanskrit after the manner of the *Cuṇṇis* from which, however, it is separated by an interval of several centuries. It deals in 21 dāras, with various rites and ceremonies of Jaina religious life, such as sammatt'-ārovaṇa-vihi; vaya-v., paḍimā-v., tava-v., paḍikkamaṇa-v., posaha-v., pavvajjā-v., utthāvaṇa-v., etc. (see Weber's *Verzeichnis*, p. 829ff.), including one (*dāra* 20) dealing

2 *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka-Literatur*, Hamburg 1935, p. III.

3 See Weber, *Verzeichnis der Sansk-und Prakrit-Handschriften*, vol. II Parts 2 and 3, p. 742ff. and Schubring, *Lehre*, p. 81ff.

4 Weber, *Verzeichnis*, p. 763ff.

5 Schubring, *Lehre*, p. 157.

with the ceremonies connected with the cremation of a dead monk, mahā-pariṭṭhāvaṇā-v. There are two versions of this text, viz.,

ĀyB—Ms. or. fol. no. 1049 in the *Pr. Staatsb.*, Berlin, written in small characters, on the whole correctly, and containing some tables.

ĀyM—Printed text published by the Āgamôdaya-samiti, Mehesana, with tolerable accuracy, Nearly identical in reading with ĀyB. This printed edition contains some short Appendices, no doubt from later hands, providing some supplementary information on topics treated of in the text itself.

- (v) N—The *Nirvāṇakalikā*, ed. with an Introduction and Notes by Mohanlal Bhagavandas Jhaveri and published in the Muni Sri Mohanlalji Jain Granthamala (5), Bombay. This work is composed in Sanskrit and is attributed to Pādalipta-sūri; it deals with rituals and ceremonies, specially those connected with the construction of shrines and installation of images. This is no doubt a late text, as can be surmised from the facts that it is written entirely in Sanskrit and that its use of terminologies are unpretentiously free from any attempts towards giving the text an ancient flavour.
- (vi) S—The *Sāmāyārīvibhi*, Ms., or. fol. no. 1119 in the *Preuss. Staatsb.* Berlin, a work of the *sāmāyārī*-class dealing with Jaina rituals and ceremonies (see Weber's *Verzeichnis*, p. 895ff.). It is composed in Prakrit mixed with Sanskrit, like Āy; in some parts, however, it is entirely in Sanskrit. Some verses at its conclusion show that the author's name was Paramānanda who was a pupil of Abhayadeva, as was Āsaḍa too, who wrote in saṃvat 1248.⁶ The Ms. is well-written from the point of view of penmanship but is full of mistakes and omissions.
- (vii) V—The *Vaggacūliyā*, Ms. or. fol. no. 2378 in the *Preus. Staatsb.*, Berlin. This short work also belongs to the aṅga-bāhira group of texts like A and is often wrongly designated as *Vaṅgacūliyā* or *Uvaṅgacūliyā*. It consists in its present form of 1 ajjhayaṇa only, which is called *Suya-hilaṇ 'uppatti* or "Rise of the dis-

6 See Weber, *Verzeichnis*, p. 85, n. 7 and Klatt, *Specimen of a literary-biographical Jaina-Onomasticon*, Leipzig 1892, p. 3.

regard of the Sacred Scriptures", and it may be that this title is yet another name of this small text. The subject-matter of this text may be summed up as follows:—

The 22 admirers of the courtesan Kāmalayā attack Aggidatta, a disciple of Bhaddabāhu, in the "Lacci" Paṛk near Mihilā. Before they reach him however, all of them fall into a well and die by the swords in their hands. (What follows is in prose): Aggidatta interrupts his ascetic practices and goes to Bhaddabāhu's teacher Jasabhadda who, together with Sambhūyavijaya, is stopping in Sāvattthī. Aggid. asks Jasabh. about the future existences of those 22 men and Jasabh. prophesies their 63 future lives in various forms which partly coincide with the present life of Kāmalayā. She turns a nun, being now 78 years of age, and converts her 22 former lovers—now born in Avantī as caṇḍālas in their 33rd existence—into lay discipleship. At this period these men revile the Jaina creed and becoming as many buffoons ridicule two Jaina monks. In their 64th birth they become merchants while Kāmal., now reborn as a Vānamantara god after having lived for 104 years, blesses their enterprises. Of the "Six Systems", not a single one attracts them and they prefer going their own way (? saṃkappikaṃ pahāvemāṇā; is saṃkap. = sva-kalpitaṃ?). At that time a general disrespect towards the Jaina doctrine and towards the monks will prevail. When these 22 men die at the age of 99, a long life in the hells will be their lot.

It is probable that this text derived its name from the "group", vagga, of the 22 men, lovers of the courtesan Kāmalayā.

In this connection we shall mention yet another short text belonging to the āṅga-bāhira class, viz., the *Viyāhacūliyā* (which we shall later refer to as Vi.). This text is often wrongly designated as *Vivāhacūliyā* and it also refers to the theme of heresy. It relates that Bhaddabāhu, the disciple of Sambhūyavijaya, explained 16 inauspicious dreams to Piyanandaṇā, the queen of Candragupta in Pāṭaliputra. The glimpse into the dismal future of the Jaina church which the interpretation of the dreams provides, induces the king to abdicate his throne and turn a lay disciple.⁷

(viii) Vm—*The Vibimaggapavā*, Ms. or. fol. no. 871 in the *Pr. Staatsb.*,

Berlin. This is another work of the sāmāyārī-class and its

7 I avail myself of this opportunity of rectifying by means of the above *data*, a printing mistake in Schubring's *Lehre*, p. 84, whereby the printer, by leaving out a line of the Ms. made the Saint Sambhūtavijaya appear as the husband of queen Priyanandā! The 3 āṅga-bāhira texts are noticed briefly in *Lehre*, p. 83f.

authorship is ascribed to the well-known Jinaprabhasūri (saṃvat 1349-69, see Klatt's *Specimen*, p. 12) who composed it about s. 1363, i.e. a few years before the end of his life. Like Āy and S, this text also is composed in a mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit. It treats of the various Jaina rituals in an elaborate manner and is the longest of the sāmāyārī texts we have to deal with. Of its 41 dāras, dāras 31-38 are composed entirely in Sanskrit, and dāra 29 (folios 53Af.) deals with the cremation of a deceased monk, a topic to which reference has already been made above under Āy. This text is reported upon in Weber's *Verzeichnis*, p. 861ff.

Relation of A with the other texts

The present study is based on A as the main text. Two aspects link this text with the other texts mentioned above, viz., (i) A deals with certain topics common to two of the aṅga-bāhira texts, V and V₁, e.g. heresies and decline of the Jaina church; apart from this theme, A has hardly anything in common with V and V₁ as regards style and subject-matter, and (ii) a similarity of contents which binds A to the rest of the texts, i.e., Āv, Āv_v, Āy, N, S, and V_m. In respect of subject-matter they run often on parallel and at times on identical lines, although the *spirit* of A is wholly unknown to these texts. We arrive thus at a paradox, viz., that texts which resemble A in spirit have nothing in common with it as regards their form, while texts which resemble A in form know nothing of its *spirit*.

A, our main text, justifies its assumption of the title of the "Crown of the Aṅgas" by declaring that it adorns the Eleven Aṅgas just as the white summit adorns the Meru (Kaṇaya-giri), as the diadem adorns the head of men and women.....as the tilaya adorns the forehead, the kuṇḍalas the ears.....the collyrium the eyes, etc. (A, sec. I, see below). This is surely a lofty claim to make. Perhaps our author attempted to establish the authenticity of the text by glorifying it in this manner. Let us divide the contents into 21 sections, according to the various topics under consideration.

Contents of the Ms. A

Section 1 (AB & AS fol. 1Bf.)—It begins in the traditional manner of introduction with 'teṇaṃ kālēṇaṃ teṇaṃ samaeṇaṃ' etc. with a description

of the city of Campā, of the Puṇṇabhadda shrine, and of the arrival there of Suhamma, the disciple of Mahāvīra. Jambū, a disciple of Suhamma, asks him, after the traditional manner, about the contents of this text whereupon Suhamma describes how (as has just been mentioned) this text justifies its title, and that

सा अंगचूलिया निगगंथानं निगगंथीनं सम्मं जाणियव्वा फासियव्वा तोरियव्वा किट्ठियव्वा भुज्जोऽस अत्था स हेउआ सवागरणा गुरुपरम्परागमेण गहियव्वा⁸

Sec. II (AB & AS, 2A).—On Jambū's question, Suhamma gives a brief description of guruparamparāgama, the bearers of which are said to be only those who have been initiated into the Order in accordance with the traditional ceremonies, paramparāe pavvāvaṇa-vihie dikkhiā se paramparāgamaṇe buccai.

Sec. III (AB & AS, 2Aff.).—On Jambū's further question, Suhamma describes the traditional ceremonies of initiation.

Sec. IV (AB & AS 3Bf.).—Suhamma goes on to narrate that there are, however, some monks who are not initiated in the traditional manner and that such monks are to be regarded as heretics. Seeing the shortcomings of traditionally initiated monks, they enter into and lead an ascetic life, independent of a teacher. Such heretics are to be condemned in the strongest terms. They arrogate to themselves superiority of conduct and knowledge and blame those ascetics who follow the tradition. They will suffer punishment in hell and will mislead the laity.

Sec. V (AB & AS 4Aff.).—Suhamma continues to narrate encounters between the traditional or orthodox monks on the one hand and the self-constituted or unorthodox monks on the other. The latter, when challenged by the orthodox to state to what gaṇa, sāhā, or kula they belong and by whom they have been initiated into ascetic life and practices, take recourse to violent invectives and abuse the followers of tradition. A heated dispute follows in course of which the unorthodox declare that a parley between them is useless because "there can be no comparison between swans and crows, horses and donkeys, elephants and buffaloes, or between the brave and the coward". Among the terms of abuse used, are hiṇ 'āyariyā, paṇ-

8 Cf. सम्मं कायेण फसित्ता पालित्ता सोभित्ता तोरित्ता किट्ठित्ता आवाहित्ता आयाण अणुपालित्ता..... स-अत्थं स-हेउयं स-कारणं स-सुत्तं स-अत्थं स-उभयं स वागरणं भुज्जो २ उवदंसेइ—*Kalpasūtra*, Sāmācārī, 63-64. Note here the absence of any mention of guruparamparāgama which A adds.

ḍura-paḍa- pāuraṇā⁹ dhaṇa-kaṇag'āi-dhāragā, etc. The unorthodox declare themselves as true sāhus and fail to see what might speak against them. Moreover, they claim that Sīmandhara (a tīrthaṅkara living at present in Mahāvīdeha, a distant part of the earth, see *Lehre* p. 139) is their teacher and that all kevalīs and siddhas are their teachers; they say that they are like the Patteya-Buddhas who needed no teachers or gaṇa, sāhā, or kula. They assert that having discarded the wrong practices of others, they alone practise the true doctrine, while the orthodox, following, as they do, the upholders of false doctrines, cannot claim this, for, "Can mangoes grow on a nimba-tree?" The orthodox section are then described as rebutting these claims of their adversaries and as establishing their own superiority on the strength of their being followers of guru-paramparāgama. Then the unorthodox are denounced in scathing terms.

Sec. VI (AB & AS 6Af.)—Suhamma goes on to narrate that some such self-constituted monks imitate the ways of the orthodox and get a following among the laity by declaring falsely that they trace their spiritual descent from such and such sages. When their pretentious claims are exposed by the orthodox, it leads to strife and dissensions among the followers of the unorthodox.

Sec. VII (AB, 6Bf.; AS, 6Bf.)—Strife and dissensions among the laity make some of them leave their gaṇa, specially when they discover the slackness of conduct on the part of some of their teachers; this, in its turn, has a bad effect on the faithful members of the community.

Sec. VIII (AB, 7Af; AS, 7Bf.)—These dissensions among the followers of those false teachers, affect injuriously also those members of the community who are not followers of such teachers.

Sec. IX (AB, 7Bf.; AS, 8Af.)—Jambū asks, somewhat irrelevantly, what the term gaṇa means and Suhamma declares that the term denotes a body of monks and nuns, or where the "Five jewels among men", pañca-

9 i.e. 'those who wear white garments'; a little later the unorthodox again describe the forerunners of the orthodox as seya-paḍa-dharagā, śveta-paḍa-dhārakāḥ, 'wearers of white 'clothes'. The wearing of white garments, as practised by the Svetāmbaras, seems therefore to have been viewed with great disapproval. In contrast with this, the unorthodox group use the terms mala-malinga-gattā or m°-m°. sarirā 'having their bodies covered with dirt' as complimentary; accumulation of dirt on the body is regarded as a virtue by the Jainas, see *Lehre*, p. 168. But in one place the unorthodox are described as being of similar dress, sārīsa-vese, as the orthodox.

purisa-ṛayaṇā, are available. The "Five jewels" comprise of the āyariya, uvajjhāya and other ranks of seniority in the Order. Jambū then asks about the ceremony of ordination of an āyariya. Suhamma first describes the different kinds of āyariya, including their comparison with four kinds of baskets (known already from *Tbāṇ*. 4. 4; cf. also WZKM, 3. 331) and then characterises the best kind of āyariyas as titthagara-samā.

Sec. X (AB, 8Aff.; AS, 8Bff.)—Suhamma describes the ceremony of ordination of an āyariya.

Sec. XI (AB, 10A; AS, 10f.)—The ceremony of ordination of an uvajjhāya.

Secs. XII-XV (AB, 10Af.; AS, 10Bf.)—The ceremonies of ordination of other ranks of seniority, viz., pavattī, therā, gaṇāvachcheya, mahattarā, and pavattiṇī.

Sec. XVI (AB, 10Bff.; AS, 11Aff.)—The mode of ascertaining the right time, particularly for the study of the sacred scriptures.

Sec. XVII (AB, AS 13Bff.)—The technique and plan of study of the sacred scriptures, and the formalities to be observed in connection therewith.

Sec. XVIII (AB, 19Af.; AS, 19B)—Laudation of the plan of study described in the last Sec., and condemnation of those who do not follow it.

Sec. XIX (AB, 19Bf.; AS, 19Bff.)—Most praiseworthy among the four kinds into which the laity may be divided, are those who maintain a fraternal or maternal or paternal disposition towards each other, whereas those who change their gaṇa or adhere to heretical views are to be condemned.

Sec. XX (AB, 20Aff.; AS, 20Bf.)—Only such teachers are praiseworthy who do not admit monks who have foregone the ceremony of initiation (as described in Sec. III); otherwise they must perform confession in the manner laid down in *Vav*. (1. 34).

Sec. XXI (AB, 21A; AS, 21Af.)—A short epilogue.

The contents of A, as summed up in the above Secs. may be divided into two parts,¹⁰ viz.,

(i) an "enveloping mass" consisting of Secs. I-II, IV-VIII, and XIX-XXI, which speaks of heresy and decline of religion, and within which is embedded,

(ii) a "middle-portion" consisting of Secs. IX-XVIII (to which may also be added Sec. III), which describe the various rites and cere-

¹⁰ Schubring, *Orient. Literaturzeitung*, Oct. 1926, p. 910ff.

monies connected with initiation, confirmation, ordination, time-taking, study etc.

Of these two parts, we might regard (i) as embodying the "spirit" of the texts, and (ii) as representing the form of the text (see p. 476); the first links A to the two aṅga-bāhira texts, V & Vi, and the second, which is somewhat casually introduced in the text, links it to the other texts mentioned above.

The "spirit" of A

It would be obvious from the above review of the contents of A that its starting-point was the need for the maintenance of the unbroken tradition of guruparamparā. This imperative need arose because orthodoxy was in danger; there were people within the church who claimed to be teachers and had a following among the laity, but who, however, disregarded orthodox practices, disdained established authority, and went their own way. We may well imagine how fiercely hostile the two rival groups were towards each other, if we only take notice of the severe polemics and invectives which they indulged in. We may reasonably infer that the picture thus presented to us, is a reflection of actual conditions which prevailed in the community at that time viz., decline of orthodoxy, neglect of ecclesiastical formalities, and disregard of tradition and authority, on the part of a number of members of the Order. These unorthodox members did not stand alone but had a large following among the laity, and bitter mutual recrimination between the rival groups was the order of the day. That this state of affairs within the church was no mere fiction of the imagination of the author of A, finds support through a similarly dismal picture of the decline of Jainism presented by V and Vi, texts which appear to be more or less contemporaneous with A.

Relation between A and the ritual texts

As has already been mentioned, A has many points of contact with the ritual texts in its descriptions of various rites and ceremonies. We shall indicate now the parallels between A and these texts. On the left hand column are mentioned the relevant portions of A, and on the right hand column, the names and portions of the other texts which are parallel to those portions of A:—

A, Sec. III—ceremonies of initiation and confirmation of a pupil, pavvāvaṇa-
vihi and uvatṭhāvaṇa-*vihi*;

Āy, dāras 7 & 8,¹¹ pravrajyā-*vidhi*
and upasthāpanā-*vidhi*, ĀyB, 5Bff; ĀyM,
14Aff;

N¹²—

S, pravrajyā—and utthāpanā-*vidhi*,
10Bf, 12B;

Vm, pavvajjā- and utthāvanā-*vihi*,
22Aff, 25Aff,

A, Sec. X—ceremony of ordination
of an āyariya, ṭhavaṇa-*vihi*;

Āy, dāra 11, sūri-pada-sthāpanā-
vidhi, ĀyB, 10Bff, ĀyM, 26Aff;

N, ācāryābhiṣeka, 7Bff;

S, ācārya-pada-sthāpanā-*vidhi*, 24Bff;

Vm, āyariya-paya-ṭṭhāvaṇa-*vihi*,
45Aff;

A, Sec. XI—ceremony of ordination
of an uvajjhāya;

Āy, dāra 12, upādhyāya-pada-sthā-
panā-*vidhi*, ĀyB, 11B, ĀyM, 28A;

S, upādhyāya-pada-sth.-v., 25Bf.;

Vm, uvajjhāya-paya-ṭṭhāvaṇa-*vihi*,
45A;

A, Secs. XII-XV—ceremonies of
ordination of other ranks of seniority;

Āy, dāras 13-17, ĀyB, 11B, ĀyM,
28Aff.;

S, only ordination of mahattarā
(treated of in A, Sec. XV and Āy, dāra
16), 26A;

Vm, only ordination of mahattarā and
pavattiṇi (treated of in A, Sec. XV &
Āy, dāras 16-17), 48Aff.;

A, Sec. XVI—ascertainment of the
proper time for study, kālaggahaṇa-*vihi*;

Āv, xviii, asajjhāyaniṇijjutti, 55Aff.;

Āvv, asvādhyāyika-niryukti, 288Bff.;

Āy, dāra 9, kāla-grahaṇa-*vidhi*, ĀyB,
6Bff., ĀyM, 16Bff.; ĀyM, Appendix

11 In ĀyB two dāras have wrongly been numbered as 8 and in ĀyM dāra 6 has wrongly been numbered as 7, a mistake which has been continued until it is set right again by having two dāras numbered as 9. Schubring's article in Orient. Literaturzeitung mentioned above at p. 9, n. 10 omitted to mention the concurrence between A. and Āy, in respect of the ceremonies of initiation and confirmation.

12 Although N. 5Bff. has a chapter entitled dikṣā-*vidhi*, it deals however with the initiation not of a monk but of a lay disciple, as is evident from the vow of limited continence, para-strīṇ na kāmāyet, whereas an ascetic has to practise absolute celibacy.

40Aff., asajjhāya-vidhi, paraphrases the first portion of Āy, dāra 9;

S, anadhyayana—and kālagrahaṇa-vidhi, 13Aff.;

Vm, aṇajjhāya—and kālaggaḥaṇa-vihi, 27A-30B;

A, Sec. XVII, mode of study, joga-vihi;

Āy, dāra 10, joga-vihi, ĀyB, 8Aff., ĀyM, 20Aff.;

S, yoga-vidhi, 12Bff.;

Vm, joga-vihi, sajjhāyapaṭṭhāvaṇa-v., joga-nikkheva, kappākappa-vihi, tavo-v., joga-vihāna-payarana, kappatippa-āmāyāri, & vāyaṇā-vihi (the last two items are given after the completion of the general chapter entitled joga-vihi), 26B-27A, 30B-44A.

Relation between A and Āy

Among the parallels that have just been mentioned, those between A and Āy deserve special attention. As Schubring has pointed out these parallels between A and Āy run almost on concurrent lines, although here and there A slightly abbreviates or amplifies the readings in Āy. Occasionally slight verbal alterations too are noticeable, but of special significance are these, viz.,

(a) The Sanskrit clauses in prose in Āy are found in Prakrit in A, i.g.

Āy, dāra 11 (ordination of an āyariyā):—

एवं शिष्य-परीक्षां कृत्वा प्रशस्ते तिथिनक्षत्र-सुहृत्तादी गृहीते च प्राभातिक-काले प्रस्थापिते च गुरु-शिष्याभ्यां स्वाध्याये, प्रशस्ते जिनभवनादि-क्षेत्रे अक्षत- (read अक्षत) गुरुयोग्य-निषयाद्वये च कृते अनुयोगानुज्ञार्थं कृत-लोचस्य शिष्यस्य शिरसि गुरुर्गन्धानभिमन्त्रय क्षिपति, ततः प्राग्बद्धे वानभिवन्द्य वन्दनं दत्त्वा अनुयोगानुज्ञार्थं द्वावपि सप्तविंशत्युच्छ्वासमानं कायोत्तमर्गं कुरुतः, ततश्चतुर्विंशति-स्त्वं भणित्वा नमस्कार-पूर्वमूर्ध्वस्थितो गुरु-रन्यो वा स्वलितादिगुणोपेतं (read पेतो) बृहन्नन्दिसूत्रं आकर्षति शिष्यस्त्वद्वाविनतकायः कृतकर-कुङ्कुमलः प्रवर्द्धमान-संवेगः सावधानमनाः शृणोति, ततः सङ्घस्य वासदानं ततः शिष्यो वन्दित्वा भणति, etc.

The above extract appears in A, Sec. X prakritised almost word by word in this form:—

एयाए विहोए सुसोसस्त परिकखा काऊख दुसमसमयाणुभावेण पसत्थे तिहिनक्खत्त-सुहृत्ते गहिण पाभाइअकाले पवेइए गुरुसोसे सज्झायं करित्ता पसत्थजिणभवणाइखित्ते

अक्खए गुरुजुग्गे निसज्जादुगे कायव्वे ; अणुओगणुएणावणत्थं कयलोयस्स सीसस्स सिर
गुरुणो वासगण्धेडमिमन्तिऊण सीसे खिवन्ति सुसीसस्स ; तओ पुव्वविहीए देवे वन्दावेइसा
अणुओगणुएणावणत्थं काउस्सग्गं कीरइ सत्तावीसुस्सां दुव्वेव गुरुसीसाओ ; तओ
पयडं चउवीसत्थयं सुत्तं पडित्ता वारतिगं पंचमंगलुच्चारणं ति ; उद्धट्ठिओ गुरु अओ वा
अक्खलियाइगुणो नन्दिसुत्तं कड्ढइ, वुट्ठसोसो अहोनयकायिओ जोडिअकरकमलकुम्मलो
पवड्ढमाणसंवेगो सुणेइ ; तओ सीसो वन्दिता भणइ, c.g.

Instances like these are of frequent occurrence and they need not be further multiplied.

(b) The Sanskrit verses in Āy, dāra 11 have remained intact, i.e. un-Prakritised in A, Sec. X. This is a marked departure from the practice followed in regard to prose passages, as shown in (a).

(c) At the close of Sec. XVI of A (which corresponds to dāra 9 of Āy) there appear, curiously enough, the words “*dāraṃ 9*” which do not at all belong to A (for it neither calls its own chap. *dāras*, nor does it number them), and have no doubt been taken over from Āy where it has its proper place.

(d) In dāra 12, Āy has idṛg-guṇa-yuktasyôpādhyāyatvam dīyate; A, Sec. XI omits to render this sentence into Prakrit and reproduces it exactly as found in Āy, providing us with the lone instance of Sanskrit prose in A, to which reference was made on p. 1 above. The first word “*idṛg*” appears, however, in A as “*iddha*” which may be taken as the Prakritisation of *idṛg* or as the scribe’s confusing *ḍḍh* with *ḍṛ* and leaving out the final *g*.

(e) The Nandi-kaḍḍhaṇa or recitation of the Nandī-text is presupposed in A, Sec. XI (= Āy, dāra 12) while it appears in its full wording in A, Sec. XVIII (= Āy, dāra 10). This anomaly of an earlier chap. presupposing a later one can be explained only thus that when A was composing Sec. XI, it borrowed from a chap. in Āy (viz., dāra 12) which presupposed the Nandī-vaḍḍhaṇa because this dāra came after dāra 10 where the Nandī-K. had already been given in full (see table above on p. 481-2).

(f) A, Secs. X-XVII, i.e., nearly the whole of the “middle portion” dealing with ritual (see p. 479), are not introduced in the manner of a dialogue between Suhamma and Jambū, consistent with the style of the rest of the text, but are narrated descriptively, as they are in Āy.

(g) The “middle portion” of A, viz. Secs. III and IX-XVIII, which bear such a striking resemblance with Āy, are somewhat incongruous with the other portions of A which we have called the “enveloping mass” (see above, p. 479).

The above facts present us with some problems regarding the date and history of A which, as Schubring says, are "remarkable, nay even enigmatical." One conclusion, however, is unavoidable—and this conclusion will also partly explain the enigma—viz., that A knew Āy, borrowed from it, and transformed the Sanskrit portions of Āy into its own Prakrit.

The borrowing however, was not merely mechanical but had an organic character, for, we find that the somewhat incongruous "middle portion" is not wholly foreign to the text, because Sec. II prepares the way for Sec. III (where the "Middle portion" starts), Sec. IV knows what has gone before, Sec. IX prepares the way for Sec. X, and Sec. XVIII continues the theme treated of before. The borrowing was constructive; an architect, for instance, sets out to construct a temple; he plans the gate-way, the walls, the cupola, etc. which are peculiar to a temple. Now, in the same city where the architect dwelt, there stood a magnificent old royal palace, with the workmanship of the pillars and with the design of the halls whereof, our architect is well familiar, and he feels that he can imitate these and work them into the design of the temple he is going to construct. Consciously or unconsciously, the plan and design of the old royal palace influence our architect to such an extent that when he has finished building his new structure, the edifice looks just like a temple from outside, but inside, in its halls and pillars, it reminds the visitor of the scenes of the royal palace, so much so, that when the visitor examines closely the details of the new structure, he finds that one particular pillar not only resembles strongly a pillar in the royal palace but an inscription engraved at the foot of the pillar in the palace, has also been inadvertently reproduced in its replica in the temple (we refer to the tell-tale postscript "dāraṃ 9" of Āy found at the end of Sec. XVI of A), and, that another inscription on the wall eulogising the grandeur of the edifice, also copied from the palace, refers to the structure not as a "temple" but as a "palace" (we refer to the short Sanskrit prose sentence *īdrg-guṇa-yuktasya* etc., in Āy, not prakritised in A). That is what practically happened to A as regards its relation to Āy.

The probable date of Āy

If A therefore is indebted to, and is younger than, Āy, as would seem evident from the points we have just discussed, then it will be useful in ascertaining the date of A, to enquire into the probable age of Āy. Unfortunately, in this matter we have no definite data to build a hypothesis

upon, except that of similarity of contents and a general affinity of character and style between Āy and the two other ritual texts, S and Vm, of which the dates are known (see above pp. 474 & 476).

S was composed about saṃvat 1248, i.e., c. 1191 A.C. and Vm in sam. 1363 i.e., c. 1306 A.C. We arrive thereby at a period between the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 14th centuries A.C. Āy also very probably belongs to this epoch. But while the style of Vm is elaborate, Āy inclines towards economy of words and resorts to abbreviation by using catch-words; again, while Vm. treats of the themes of the time and plan of study under many headings (see above, p. 482), Āy treats of them in two compressed dāras, 9 & 10. These point to the inference that Āy is perhaps younger than Vm—a conclusion which is further strengthened by these considerations, viz.,

(i) A borrows verbally not from S or Vm but from Āy, which shows that Āy stood closer to A in point of time than did S or Vm, for, it is a tendency of later texts to model themselves not after older texts but after some text which was greatly in vogue shortly before or during the time these later texts arose.¹³ Or, in other words, Āy is younger than S or Vm.

(ii) In dāra 9, Āy has borrowed not only from *Obanij.* but also from Droṇa's commentary to Ohan. We do not know Droṇa's date but judging from the fact that he wrote his commentary in mixed Sansk. and Prakrit style, he also probably belonged to this epoch, and Āy is younger than him.

Now, if Vm belongs to the beginning of the 14th cent. and if Āy is younger than Vm, then we may allow an interval of half-a-century between the two and tentatively suggest the latter half of the 14th cent. as the probable date of Āy. Taking into consideration the nature and extent of A's indebtedness to Āy, we may allow the lapse of a century between the two texts. This gives us the latter half of the 15th cent. as the probable date of A. We shall consider this as the upper limit of the age of A and shall now look for other evidence of its date.

The probable date of A.

In AS (but not in AB or AP) in the middle of Sec. VI (see p. 478 above), there is an important piece of internal evidence regarding the age of A in

¹³ See Sen, Amulyachandra, *A Critical Introduction to the Pañhāvāgarāṇḍīm*, Würzburg 1936, p. 15ff.

the shape of the mention of a definite date. Describing the strife between the unorthodox and the orthodox sections of the church, the challenging of the former by the latter, and the final defeat and expulsion of the former this section makes Suhamma say :—

AS, 6B, line 2 :—

परं जम्बू ! विक्रम-वच्छराओ पच्छा सोलस-वास-सए वड्कन्ते पन्नास-वासमज्जेगणे एगे
केहं महानुभागसुरियो पमायं सुत्तूण (AB-पढत्तूण) संजमधरा भारवसहाहव जिन-पन्नत्ते मग्गे
जट्ठिस्सन्ति, ते तेसिं अ'चलं गाहकणं निरालम्बणाणं निच्छोडिस्सन्ति=कओ रे, पाविट्ठा !
तु'हाणं गणो ह्यो ? केहं तुमे पाठिआ ? केहं तु'हाणं उहे ससमुहे से संदिसाविये ? आगासे
कुसुमं केरिसं होयि ? वंभा-पुत्ता केरिसा हुन्ति ? सस-विसाणे केरिसे हुन्ति ? तहा तुमे ३वि
शुरु-परम्परावाहिरा कयो साहु ? etc.

In AB and AP the *underlined* words in the above extract are missing, and the statement goes straight and unbroken from *Jambū* to *gane ege kei* etc.

The extract just quoted purports to say that the extermination of heresy in the hands of stalwart believers, risen again in the true doctrine, and the re-establishment of orthodoxy will take place within samvat 1650 i.e., within c. 1593 A.C.

We have to remember in this connection that the condition in the church which A portrays, is one of strife and disorder, and it professes to predict that by this date the orthodox would secure triumph over their adversaries.

Now, one who complains of and suffers under a grievance, naturally envisages an end of it in not a very distant future. If the downfall of heresy and the revival of the true doctrine were assigned to 1593 A.C. i.e., to the end of the 16th cent., could we then take it that the heresy and decline of religion complained of, took place nearly a century or a half-century earlier, i.e., about the beginning or the middle of the 16th century? If the author of A lived in this period, it would allow sufficient time for his borrowing from Āy, remembering that we have proposed to assign Āy tentatively to the latter half of the 14th cent. (see above p. 485).

If on the other hand we assume that the author of A not only knew of the disorderly condition in his church but that the revival which he prophesies was also an event that had happened before his time and of which he had knowledge (in the same manner as the recording by the Purāṇas in prophetic style of lists of dynasties that had preceded them), then the revival which the author of A envisages, finds some manner of corroboration in

historical events during the reign of Akbar, at a period which closely approaches the date mentioned by AS as the date of the revival of Jainism, viz., 1593 A.C.

A historian tells us¹⁴ that Akbar "listened to the lessons of the Jain holy men so attentively that he is reckoned by Jain writers among the converts to their religion", and that many of Akbar's acts from 1582 onwards "were the direct outcome of his partial acceptance of Jain doctrine". In 1582 Akbar sent for and received with all the pomp of imperial pageantry, the celebrated Jaina saint Hīravijaya who "persuaded the emperor to release prisoners and caged birds, and to prohibit the killing of animals on certain days. In the following year (1583) those orders were extended, and disobedience to them was made a capital offence. Akbar renounced his much-loved hunting and restricted the practice of fishing. The Sūri (Hīravijaya)was granted the title of *jagad-guru* or world-teacher,..... Three years later the emperor issued written orders confirming the abolition of *jizya* tax and prohibiting slaughter during periods amounting collectively to half of the year. The Sūri's colleague, Bhānucandra, remained at court. In 1593 Siddhicandra, who visited Akbar at Lahore, also received an honorary title, and was granted control over the holy places of his faith. The tax on pilgrims to Śatruñjaya was abolished at the same time. The temple of Ādiśvara on the holy hill of Śatruñjaya near Palitana in Kathiawar, which had been consecrated by Hīravijaya in 1590, has on its walls a Sanskrit inscription of unusual length, which combines the praises of the Sūri with those of Akbar, and gives particulars of the emperor's generosity". Vijaya-sena Sūri, another Jaina teacher, who is included along with Hīravijaya and Bhānucandra in Abu-l Fazal's list of the most learned men of the time, also must have enjoyed the patronage of Akbar.

The above account throws no light of course on the question of disorder in the church, but the fact that during this period Jainism scored a public success by persuading the powerful emperor, through Hīravijaya and other leading personalities of the orthodox church to adopt important measures in consonance with its doctrines, can be regarded as a revival of Jainism and it seems to have played a part in the mention, no matter by whose hands, of that date in AS in round numbers (Samvat 1650, corresponding to 1593 A.C.) which synchronises with the period of Akbar's patronage of Jainism

14 Vincent, Smith, *Akbar*, p. 166-68.

and Hīravijaya's demise a year-earlier (1592). That imperial patronage of a sect and of its eminent teachers should coincide with, or be shortly preceded by, disorderly conditions within that church, need not necessarily surprise us. When Aśoka gave his powerful and enthusiastic support to the cause of Buddhism, there was certainly much of lack of agreement in the Buddhist church itself, as Aśoka's own statements would show,¹⁵ when Harṣa honoured Hiuen Tsang and proclaimed the triumph of Mahāyāna through his learned and pious foreign protégé, the conditions within the Buddhist church too were by no means satisfactory.¹⁶

If the author of A had personal knowledge of events which happened about 1593 A.C., then he surely must have composed his work towards the end of the 16th century, or perhaps still later. If he did not personally experience the happenings about 1593 A.C., but was only hoping his church to recover from the bad days it had fallen into, then too he must have lived not very long before that date when the recovery actually took place. In both cases we presume, of course, that the mention of that date in AS is to be ascribed to the author of A. If that be so, then the question very naturally arises as to why and how this important mention of a date in AS came to be omitted in AB and AP.

The answer to this question is perhaps to be found in the decidedly inferior character of AB and AP, compared with AS in respect of textual correctness. Again, the omission of this date in AB and AP may not be accidental but deliberate. The mention of such a late date in a text which claims to be canonical, might have so scared the priestly scribes that they judged it wiser to be silent about it by ignoring and dropping it. The omission of the date on this ground would be more natural and easier to understand than the other alternative, viz., that the date was purposely introduced into AS by a later scribe—a liberty one would hardly dare to take in respect of a text come to be regarded as sacred.

A is younger than V

The late date of A we have just inferred on the strength of the date supplied by AS, is corroborated by another chronological datum.

While A's indebtedness to Āy is obvious though not admitted, it is admittedly younger than V, for, right at the close of Sec. XXI, A says:

¹⁵ Minor Pillar Inscriptions of Sanchi and Sarnath; *Camb. Hist. of Ind.* 1922, p. 498.

¹⁶ Smith, V.A., *Early Hist. of Ind.*, 3rd Ed., p. 346.

sāhūṇaṃ hilaṇtā mamāvi hiliṣṣanti, sesaṃ Uvāṅgacūliyāto gaheyaṃvāṃ! Here is a clear reference to V which, as has already been mentioned, is also wrongly called *Uvaṅgacūliyā* and consists of a chapter entitled Śuya-hilaṇ 'uppati, a topic to which too A's words "sāhūṇaṃ hilaṇtā mamāvi hiliṣṣanti" seem to refer. If A knows and refers to V by name, it is to be concluded that A is younger than V. If we knew the date of V, we would thereby have some important light thrown on the date of A.

Now, V fol. 12A says in the manner of a prophecy that the mahā-udao or "the great rise" of disrespect towards the sacred scriptures would take place 1699 years after Samprati (the grand-son of Aśoka) and that Samprati himself would flourish 291 years after Mahāvīra. That gives us $1699 + 291 = 1990$ years after Mahāvīra = c. 1474 A.C.¹⁷ If we apply to this prophecy of V the same test as is applied to the dynastic lists of the Purāṇas and as we proposed to apply also to the mention of a date in AS, then we must have to conclude that the author of V had knowledge of conditions prevailing in 1474 A.C., or in other words he composed his work after 1474 A.C. i.e., towards the end of the 15th or the beginning of the 16th century. Now, well-known as V was to the author of A, we would be justified in allowing an interval of something like half-a-century between V and A. This would yield the result that the beginning or the middle of the 16th cent. has to be regarded as the date of A, calculated on this basis. It will now be observed that the age of A inferred thus in its relation to V, tallies exactly with its age concluded from the mention of a date in AS, (see p. 486). This date of A, viz., the 16th cent., agrees very well too with its upper limit as inferred from its indebtedness to Āy, viz., latter half of the 15th cent.

A is a substituted text

If we have succeeded so far in arriving at a tentatively satisfactory solution of the enigma regarding the date of A, a puzzle still remains.

In Sec. XVII, A mentions its own name in the list of canonical texts; further, Āy, S, and Vm—all of which we have found above to be older than A—also mention the name of A in their lists of canonical texts in passages corresponding to A, Sec. XVII (see above p. 478). How is it possible, it may be asked, for so young a text as we have found A to be, to find a place in

17 See end of Schubring's article referred to above at p. 481, n. 1.

those as well as in other old lists? Schubring has cautioned us against attempting too rash a solution of this problem by assuming that the inclusion of A in those lists is a matter of simple interpolation.

Perplexing though the problem may appear to be, its solution however, is a matter of no great difficulty. The explanation lies in a phenomenon that has occurred often enough in the history of the Jaina canon, viz., that an older text of the same name had existed before, but which became lost and a new text was substituted later in its place, and was passed off under the older name.¹⁸ Such a fate befell the present form of the 2nd śrutaskandha entitled "dhammakahā" of the *Nāyadhammakahā* (the 6th Āṅga); to *Aṇuttarōvavāiyadasāo* (the 9th Āṅga); to *Paṇhāvāgaraṇāim* (the 10th Āṅga); to the 2nd śrutaskandha called Suhavivāga of the *Vivāgasūya* (the 11th Āṅga); and, to the *Mahānisiha* (which is called the 2nd, and sometimes the 6th, Cheyasutta). If such loss and subsequent substitution could have taken place in respect of texts of such sanctity as those just mentioned, there is no wonder that a text of far lesser sanctity as an āṅga-bāhira text like A would also share the same fate.

If this really happened to A, then it must have happened also to V and VI, companions of A in the āṅgabāhira class, which are mentioned along with A in those old lists but which, as we have seen above, belong to the same epoch as A. It is no wonder therefore that the Jainas regard them as being "outside the Āṅgas", i.e., non-canonical, if we take the Āṅgas in their broader implication to mean the canon.

Very probably this fact that the author of A was attempting to give an ancient flavour to his composition,—another well-known tendency met with in the history of the Jaina canon¹⁹ explains the reason for his transforming the Sanskrit portions of Āy into Prakrit. Āy as well as its predecessors S and Vm, tried to imitate the style of the Cūṇṇis by writing in mixed Sanskrit and Prakrit. A, on its part, was still more ambitious; knowing that texts of antiquity were written entirely in Prakrit devoid of any Sanskrit intermixture, the author of A wrote in imitation of that ancient style. In doing so, he deliberately changed the Sanskrit portions of Āy into Prakrit. But, that his style was not genuine but merely a pose, is betrayed by the symp-

¹⁸ See Schubring, *Worte Mahāvīras*, pp. 6, 13; Schubring, *Mahānisiha*, p. 8; Sen, Amulyachandra, *Paṇhāvāgaraṇāim*, p. 6.

¹⁹ See Weber, *Indische Studien*, XVI, p. 331; Schubring, *Mahānis.*, p. 8; Sen, Amulyachandra, *Paṇhāvāg.*, p. 6.

roms of his age which he unconsciously exhibits in such traces as the anachronism of the Sanskrit verses which he reproduced intact from Āy, and the single bit of Sanskrit prose which he forgot to Prakritise.

Probable contents of the original A

In the case of some of the Jaina texts which were lost but were renovated, we know what their earlier contents might have been, but in the case of A however, we can infer but little in this direction. The original A was very probably not a ritual text. It might have had something to do with heresy, heretical views and decline of religion. The Jainas have never made any secret of heresy within their church, and decline of religion was frankly referred to as early as in *Jīṇacariya* §130 ff. The vicissitudes of rise and fall recur again and again in the history of a church. Some such occasion might have provided the background of the original A, which also influenced V and Vi, but V which knows of and mentions the reference to decline of religion in *Jīṇac.* mistakenly imagines that *Jīṇac.* referred to the same decline as V itself does.

It is not improbable that the original A might have contained references to the need of proper study of the sacred scriptures, as its name seems rather vaguely to suggest, which has been so elaborately dealt with in the present form of A.

The material with which we have to deal in A as well as in the other allied texts mentioned above, is by no means easy. They are full of expressions and technical details which are difficult to understand. The difficulties are further added to by the absence of any commentaries which might have thrown light on the many obscurities, allusions, and ritualistic technicalities and formulas. The cryptic language and style of these texts are those of priests speaking to their brother-priests, which are difficult of comprehension for the uninitiated laity.

In the second place, the readings of these texts, particularly of the different Mss. of A, are corrupt almost in every line. A mitigating feature however, is that although it would be difficult to restore textual correctness, yet a comparison of the various readings suggest often what the meaning was meant to be. But even then many obscurities and dark corners remain, which fail to be illuminated by comparison of the parallels available in the allied texts.

The Position of Wives other than the first in the Vedic Ritual*

Bhavadeva in his *Paddhati* says that after nightfall an oblation is to be offered to Sūrya first of all, and then, the mantras as mentioned above are to be uttered. The husband stands behind the wife who sits with her face towards the East. While uttering the mantras, the husband should stretch his right hand from behind on the right shoulder of the wife. Then he touches the navel of the wife with a piece of gold and mutters: "Omn. Be the mother of excellent long-living children; May you, O all-blessed one, be the nourisher of the embryo without difficulty. O one dedicated to vows! give birth to a long-living child, proloner of the race". Then a woman with husband and sons living should give the wife Pañcagavya sanctified with the above-mentioned mantras.

It does not seem necessary that the wives who have established śrauta fires need observe the domestic New and Full Moon sacrifices separately,¹²⁷ because they agree closely in the deity and other details with those of the śrauta; the only difference is that offerings of peeps are substituted for cakes and no offerings to Indra or Mahendra are made. It is also distinctly clear that much importance cannot be attached to these rites as they have not been mentioned at all by a good many Gṛhya authorities like Bharadvāja, Laugākṣi (Kāṭhaka), Baudhāyana, Jaimini, and Sāṅkhāyana, *Māṇ. GS.*¹²⁸ and *Āśv. GS.*¹²⁹ simply mention them in names.

On each New and Full Moon night they perform these sacrifices together with their husband. They are required to bathe and eat the fast-day food in the afternoon.¹³⁰ They prepare a Sthālī-pāka from which the husband offers oblations to the various deities. Then they should, according to Pāraskara,¹³¹ offer the Bali outside the house to the wife, the Man, Age, and the black-toothed white one, the Lord of bad women and those who, dwelling in the village or the forest, allure their offsprings. They then pray for welfare and offspring. They sleep that night on the ground; according

* Continued from p. 195.

127 Cf. *Baudh. GS.*, IV, 9, 1. p. 336. 128 II, 3, 3. 129 I, 10, 5.

130 *Drāh. GS.*, II, 1, 4; *Gobh. GS.*, I, 5, 26. p. 219.

131 *Pār. GS.*, I, 12, 4, p. 130, Bom. ed.; Karka, *op. cit.*, I, 23; Jayarāma, p. 131, I, 6f.; Harihara, *op. cit.*, I, 37f.; Gadādhara, p. 134, I, 10f.

to the Commentator on Gobhila,¹³² they may sleep on the self-strewn grass (svastara), too. They together with the sacrificer are expected to, the Chief Wife must, pass that night with mutual entertainment recounting tales or other discourses. They commit nothing impure on that night. If the husband is on a journey, the chief wife acts as his substitute.¹³³

In regard to the seasonal sacrifices, the *Mān. GS.*¹³⁴ says, in the event of the absence of the chief wife and the sacrificer even a Sūdrā wife is entitled to offer the morning and evening oblations to Serpents in course of the daily observance of the Śrāvaṇa sacrifice up till the Āgrahāyaneṣṭi. So there is no doubt that all other wives are entitled to offer the same in the event of failure of the chief wife. As all the women of the household are allowed to participate in the rite of alighting from the bedstead,¹³⁵ there is no doubt that all the wives join in it; they should, with their children on their lap or by their side, sit in accordance with their seniority of the time of marriage one after another next to the chief wife.

Now, so far as the purificatory (Aurdhvadehika) rites are concerned, the same rites are performed for each of them without any distinction whatsoever. If the pregnant wife dies, she should be, first of all, sprinkled with water mixed with cow's urine. When the dead body has been removed to the crematorium, the husband cuts open the child from the left side of her womb; if the child is still alive, he gives it the breast of its mother along with the prayer that the breast may be exhaustless, spring of pleasure, wealth-giver, etc.,¹³⁶ and puts it in front of the dead mother. He then tries to revert the opened womb to its normal position, at least, to make it look as though no operation has been made; anoints it with curd mixed with sacrificial clarified butter; and bathes her with water mixed with mud, ashes, Kuśa and cow's urine. She is now wrapped up in new clothes and cremated.¹³⁷ Keśavasvāmin in his *Baudhāyana-paddhati*¹³⁸

132 *Gobh. GS.*, I, 6, 5, p. 223, l. 5f.

133 *Gobh. GS.*, I, 6, 9, p. 225.

134 *Mān. GS.*, II, 16, p. 192, particularly, Aṣṭāvakra on the same. Cf. *Bhār. GS.*, II, I, p. 32.

135 Harihara on *Pār. GS.*, III, 2, p. 321, l. 5. अन्न स्त्रीणामपि मन्त्र-पाठः.

136 For the Mantra: *AV.*, 7, 10, 1; *Vāj. Samh.*, 38, 5; *Mait. Samh.*, IV, 9, 4, etc.

137 For these facts: Śaunaka as quoted in *Madana-ratna*, *Karma-kāṇḍa-pradīpa*, f. 410a, l. 4f. Also cf. *Gṛhya-kārikā* (Reṇu) and *Baudhāyana* as quoted herein; Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's *Antyeṣṭikriyā*, f. 213a, l. 9f.

138 Folios 161-62. According to him, if the child be living till then, another

says that if the husband sees the child still alive, he should offer a sacrifice there with the prayer expressive of his pleasure to get the child alive, bathe it and carry it home; then fourteen offerings are made and then she is cremated in accordance with the usual rites. The *Karma-kāṇḍa-pradīpa*¹³⁹ also quotes the opinion that herein the wife should be laid with her head towards the south, the left side of her belly measuring four fingers from the navel should be cut open. If the child be dead, it should be washed and buried. The operated part should be sewn with a thread, and anointed with clarified butter. Then after due offerings and gifts, she should be cremated.

If the wife dies after child-birth, or during her courses, she should be bathed with water mixed with Pañcagavya, according to the *Karma-kāṇḍa-pradīpa*, hundred times,¹⁴⁰ covered with a new cloth and cremated in accordance with the usual rites.¹⁴¹ According to *Vṛddhaśātātapa*,¹⁴² no saṃskāras and such other rites should be performed for a menstruating woman; she should be bathed and cremated after three nights (most probably, after the passing away of the Impurity). Gadādhara in his *Kāla-sāra*,¹⁴³ thinks the cremation, either on the same day or after the passing away of the period of (Impurity), is optional, i.e. it depends upon the intention of the chief mourner; preference, however, is given to cremation after the period of Impurity.¹⁴⁴ If she dies in a foreign country and as a consequence, the above-mentioned rites are not performed, her bones are to be collected and purified with Pañcagavya bathing and ceremonially burnt again.¹⁴⁵

If the wife of a Sāmavedin dies be she the eldest one or any other,—she should be cremated with her face downwards.¹⁴⁶ During the collection of her bones, the sprinkling and such other rites should be done with water

sacrifice should be offered on the 8th day in which cows, landed property, sesamum, gold, etc. should be given in gift.

139 *Op. cit.*, l. 7f.

140 Folio 409b, l. 1.; cf. Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, *op. cit.*, f. 212b., l. 12f.

141 *Karma-kāṇḍa-pradīpa*, f. 409a, l. 14; 409b, l. 1. According to the *Baudhāyana-paddhati* (f. 162) the water should be mixed with cow's urine.

142 As quoted in *Karma-kāṇḍa-pradīpa*, f. 409, l. 4-5.

143 P. 123.

144 The *Madana-ratna* thinks cremation within the period of Impurity should take place in emergency cases; *Karma. KP.*, f. 409b, l. 6f.

145 According to *Devayājñika*, as quoted in *Karma. KP.*, f. 409b, l. 2-3.

146 *Karma. KP.*, f. 399c. छन्दोगानां स्त्री-मरणे विशेषः, etc.

from an earthen water-vessel.¹⁴⁷ According to the Āśvalāyana school a vessel should be marked as feminine with the sex marks made prominent.¹⁴⁸

On the śrāddha days the wives should not have their hair dishevelled, should not cry, laugh or talk for nothing.¹⁴⁹

As the eating of the cake is not meant for supermundane bliss, all the wives are entitled to partake of the cake or cakes; if there are six, they partake of the middle two.¹⁵⁰ According to Chāgaleya, as quoted in the *Śrāddha-mañjari*, the cake should be divided into as many portions as there are wives and each wife should be given a portion. According to the *Prayoga-pārijāta*, if six cakes have been offered in the Śrāddha and the sacrificer has two offered, each wife should be given one cake. If there are a good many wives, a selection should be made in accordance with qualities, age and period. Or, each of them may be given one cake at the end of each Śrāddha. According to the Mayūkha, the eating of the middle cake is only optional, and not indispensable. A wife who is sick, afflicted (with some mushap), or otherwise incapable,¹⁵¹ should not eat the cake. According to Āpastamba, an ill-disposed or evil-hearted wife should also be avoided.¹⁵² If the wives are not desirous of having children, they may not eat the cake.¹⁵³

As the first wife and the husband raise up the fires and are really the protectors of them, the husband is not entitled to give up the fires on the death of any other wife than that of the first. In case of the death of the latter, an Āhitāgni is to cremate her with fire kindled from a new fire-drill or produced from the either half of a jar heated on the śrauta fires.¹⁵⁴ The husband is to relinquish the fires as he offers these to her in her death. The second wife (and naturally the third wife and the following) must not be

147 *Jaim.GS.*, II, 5, p. 30, l. 20; p. 31, l. i.

148 *Āśv. GK.*, i, 5, 4, p. 320, Bom. ed.

149 *Śrāddha-mañjari*, p. 1.

150 *Śrāddha-mañjari*, p. 39. *Śrāddhatattva*, p. 200. *Śrāddha-sūtra-kāṇḍikā*, *Pār. GS.*, Bom. ed., p. 484, l. 34; 485, l. 4. *Manu.*, Nir. ed., p. 126, v. 262; according to *Kullūka*, however, only the eldest wife should eat it. *Khā. GS.*, III, 5, 30, p. 118 (Aṣṭaka). *Mantra-Brahmaṇa*, II, 3, 14.

151 *Candrikā*, p. 402. *Śaṅkhalikṣita* quoted.

152 *Āp.*, as quoted in *Smṛti-candrikā*, p. 403.

153 Cf. the *Śrāddha-kāṇḍa* in *Smṛti-candrikā*, p. 402, where various authorities have been quoted with reference to this. Also see *Gobh. G. Parīṣiṣṭa*, p. 125, पुनःकामा । *Jaim.GS.*, II, 3, p. 29, l. 9-11 (in all the Śrāddhas).

154 *Jaim.GS.*, II, 5, p. 30 of Caland's ed.; for Comm., *op. cit.*, p. 66.

offered the sacred fires in death; the husband is not entitled to relinquish the Agnihotra out of fascination for her in which case he would be considered as the relinquisher of Brahman.¹⁵⁵

Miserable indeed is the position of a Śūdrā wife from the religious point of view. From the beginning the Ārya-Śūdrā marriage seems to be a matter of accident¹⁵⁶ and sometimes, most probably, of expediency,¹⁵⁷ on the part of the husband and as such the Śūdrā wife seems to have deserved nothing more than a few privileges from the Ārya husband; at least she has no claims in religious matters.¹⁵⁸ It is definitely stated by Manu¹⁵⁹ that she can never be the first wife of an Aryan. Even though married, she simply serves to lead the family of the husband to degradation and the progeny to the status of Śūdrās; a Brāhmaṇa is strictly forbidden either to cohabit with or have a child by her.¹⁶⁰ The sacrifice offered by her husband are not acceptable to gods.¹⁶¹ If he enters her bed immediately after taking a funeral feast, his forefathers will suffer from lying in her Impurities for a month.¹⁶² The Pālāgali cannot participate in any rite in the politico-religious ceremonies as she is a Śūdrā by birth.¹⁶³ A Śūdrā wife of one belonging to one of higher castes is not entitled to churn the fire.¹⁶⁴ The only instance where a Śūdrā wife is allowed to act as a substitute in a rite is the Śrāvaṇa sacrifice, where in the absence of the chief wife and the sacrificer and all other wives she may offer the daily oblation to snakes. But the rule is by no means universal as it is found only in the *Māṇ. GS.*¹⁶⁵ and in no other text.

155 *Kātyāyana, Chandogya-pariśiṣṭa*, Ch. XX, p. 334.

156 The custom of giving slaves as presents to princes (RV. VIII. 19, 36) and priests (as sacrificial fee), ritualistic recognition of Ārya Śūdrā Union (*Tait. Saṃb.*, VII, 4, 19, 2. *Vāj. Saṃb.*, XXIII, 50, 31), employment of Śūdrās as Anucaris and Paiveṣṭris (*Sat. Brā.*, XI, 2, 7, 4; *Kaṇṣ. Pan.*, 11, 1, slave-concubinage, (cf. *AV.*, 22, 6; XII, 3, 13; 4, 9) etc. helped many Śūdrās to rise to the favour of Aryan Masters, so much so, that most probably—not infrequently, they married them. Several Śūtrakāṭas make provision for one Śūdrā wife of one belonging to the higher castes (e.g. *Pār. GS.*, i, 4, 10). Cf. *Vāśiṣṭha*, 1, 25, and for his own view, the following Śūtras.

157 It seems the King married the Pālāgali Queen for political purposes.

158 *Manu*, III, 18; *Viṣṇu* XXVI, 5. For the legal incapacity of her children: *Baudh. DhS.*, II, 2, 3, etc. 159 III, 14.

160 *Op. cit.*, 15-17; also 19. *Viṣṇu* XXVI, 6, *Vāś. DhS.*, 1, 27.

161 *Vāś. DhS.*, XIV, 11.

162 *Gaut. DhS.*, XV, 22.

163 *Sat. Brā.*, XIII, 2, 6, 7; V, 3, 1, 11. 164 *Karma-pradīpa*, I, 8, p. 115.

165 II, 16, p. 192; particularly, the scholiast Aṣṭāvakra.

In spite of all these religious incapacabilities, the *Śūdrā* woman considers herself fortunate in having an Aryan husband; the *Tait. Saṃh.*¹⁶⁶ says in this case she does not care for wealth or prosperity.

It is sure that in religious matters, and therefore in secular matters, too, a certain number of women were compelled to lose many rights. There is no doubt that polygamy to a certain extent leads the deterioration in the position of women. This was, however, counterbalanced by polyandry which has been known in ancient, and in a lesser form in modern¹⁶⁷ India.

There are reasons to believe that polyandry existed in ancient India. The ancient Seers would never have mentioned of a common wife of the Maruts and of the Aśvins if polyandry were unknown or discarded in the society.¹⁶⁸ The *Atharvavedic* verses¹⁶⁹ saying that a woman even after having had ten former husbands, can still marry more, cannot but refer to polyandry. The case of Draupadī in the *Mahābhārata* is well-known; and the great epic asserts this much, that having many husbands is a desirable qualification for women.¹⁷⁰ In support of Draupadī's polyandrous marriage it cites the cases of Jaṭilā Gautamī, Vārksī, etc. Gautamī married seven Ṛṣis; Māriṣā married ten Havirdhānas¹⁷¹ and her son Dakṣa is known as the son of ten fathers.¹⁷² Vālī and Sugrīva are born of two husbands living at the same time.¹⁷³ The former in their turn married Tārā in common.¹⁷⁴ Āpastamba¹⁷⁵ says a daughter is given to the family of her husband though it is, in his time, forbidden. He, most probably, refers to the *Tait. saṃh.*¹⁷⁶ which says that the daughter is given to the family. Bṛhaspati¹⁷⁷ also mentions that the delivery of a marriageable damsel to a family is found in other countries (than his own). The Purāṇas also know about it.¹⁷⁸

166 VII, 4, 19.

167 Westermarck, *Short History of Marriage*, chap. X; *History of Marriage*, p. 252-55.

168 Rodasi and Sūryā. *AV.* I, 167, 4-5; the express reading of the *RV.* with reference to Rodasi, is साधारणी पत्नी Common Wife.

169 V, 17, 8-9.

170 *Mab Bh.*, I, 202, 8. इप्सितश्च गुणः स्त्रीणामेकस्या बहुभर्तृता ।

171 *Op cit.*, I, 196, 7266; cf. *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*, I, 15.

172 *Op. cit.*, I, 33, 3130; *Hari vaṃśa*, V, 66 f. 173 *Rāmāyaṇa*, VII, 42.

174 *Op cit.*, IV, (Kīṣkindhyā. Tārā-vākyaṃ) *Padma-purāṇa*, IV, 112; 143-146

175 *Db. S.*, II, 10, 27. 3. 176 VI, 1, 6, 5. 177 *Db. S.*, XXVII, 20.

178 *Brahma*, 15, 48; 54; *Matsya*, 44, 66-70; *Brahmaṇḍa*, III, 71, etc. The *Kunāla Jātaka* (Jat. No. 536) mentions that Prince Kanhā had five husbands at a time, all of whom she selected in a svayamvara assembly.

As the polygamous husband observes religious rites with wife, the polyandrous wife observes them with the eldest husband. The same reasons we have seen in the case of a polygamous husband in connection with the first wife would apply here, too. Draupadī had once to gaze at hell because she was more fond of Arjuna than her eldest husband Yūdhishṭhira. Polyandry as well as Polygamy deprived a certain number of women as well as men of various religious rights. These twin usages seem to have counter-balanced the effects of each other on the society, and consequently, on the position of women as well as men and, at least, no emphasis can be laid on Polygamy as leading to deterioration in the position of women without any counteraction.

Just as the wife is enjoined to please the husband, the husband is also enjoined to please the wife.¹⁷⁹ Where the wife and the husband are whole heartedly pleased with each other, they acquire the three objects of life (Tri-varga). They must remain satisfied with mutual partnership in all matters; they must not even think of others; for the violation of these rules they incur the same sin and undergo the same punishment without any distinction whatsoever.¹⁸⁰ For grave offences¹⁸¹ they separate from each other or they may marry again. She may remarry, if her first husband is impotent, outcast or dead or for other (similarly grave) reasons.¹⁸² She or he is to remarry, however, on the fullest knowledge that her or his marriage for the second time cannot be considered as a sacred ceremony (saṃskāra). Even though they remarry another unmarried man or woman, still the marriage cannot be accredited as a saṃskāra as each saṃskāra is to be observed only once in life and her or his marriage ceremony has been completed for ever in the first marriage.

From time immemorial¹⁸³ the wife has doubly blest her husband, by procreation as well as by participation in sacrifices. In this connection her epithets "Jāyā" and "Patnī"¹⁸⁴ are, no doubt to some extent, significant.

179 *Manu*, III, 60-61. 180 *Parāśara*, 4, 12-13; similarly, *Devala*, *Bṛhaspati*, etc.

181 For those of the wife: *Yājñavalkya*, 3, 72-73.

182 *Vaś. DhS.*, XVII, 20; *Manu* IX, 175-176; *Yājñ.*, i, 67; cf. also *Kāma-sūtra*, p. 248 (Nir. Ed.), *Sūtra* 31 (with Yaśodhara's Commentary); *Baudh DhS.*, IV, 1. 16; II, 2, 3, 27; *Viṣṇu* XV, 7; *Nārada* XII, 45ff.

183 For the Indo-Iranian period: W. Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur im Altertum*, p. 244.

184 *Pāṇini*, IV, 1, 33; cf. *Śat Brā.*, 1, 9, 2, 14. But Patañjali does not observe this distinction.

But this "Jāyātva" and "Patnītva" are by no means separable in a clear-cut way as her Jāyātva serves really for her Patnītva. She performs a religious duty by means of procreation. She as well as her husband have been born as owing debts to the gods, to the Ṛṣis, to the fathers and to man.¹⁸⁵ In order to liberate themselves from the debt to fathers, they are to marry and have children: the fathers in the other world depend for their continuance on the offerings of their children.¹⁸⁶ The ardent desire for having children for religious purposes has given women an extremely high position.¹⁸⁷ So it is only natural that she almost always prays to gods for children.¹⁸⁸ Owing to the urgent necessity of having children, productive unions are always to be effected in rituals so much so that even the vessels, spoons or other sacrificial implements are often imagined as males and females. Progeny is one of the primary objects of performing sacrifices. The wife as the bearer of this highest blessing on earth deserves respect from the husband as well as from the society. The husband is bound to respect her as in her, the Jāyā, he is born again, and as she, offered as great Brilliance to him by the gods and the seers, is his mother again.¹⁸⁹

According to Cook, Greek women are excluded from the cult of Theos Megus, Zeus and Tachnepsis,¹⁹⁰ from Mithraic rites,¹⁹¹ and the race of Drypole;¹⁹² but there is not a single Vedic ritual from which they are excluded. In the Pravargya sacrifice the wife wraps up her head. This does not mean exclusion at all; on the other hand, it is a part of her ritualis-

185 *Sat Brā.*, I, 7, 2, 1; also IX, 4, 1, 5; *Tait Brā.*, VI, 3, 5; 10; III, 7, 9, 8; *AV.*, VI, 117, 3; *Tait. Āraṇ.*, VII, 11, 5; *Tait. Upan.*, I, 9; *Ait. Āraṇ.*, I, 3, 5, 6; *Bṛh. Up.*, VI, 4; *Vaś DhS.*, VIII, 11; *Bandh. DhS.*, II, 3, 2, 1, etc.

186 It will be seen in this connection that in the water-libations and Śrāddhas, water and cake are offered to the parents of both the mother as well as the father.

187 *RV.*, I, 9, 20; III, 1, 25; X, 85, 25, etc. *AV.*, III, 23, 2; V, 25, 11; VI, 11, 2, etc. *Tait. Samh.*, VI, 3, 89, 5; *Tait. Brā.*, I, 5, 6; *Ait. Brā.*, VII, 13; *Ait. Āraṇ.*, II, 3, 7, 3; 5, 1, 1-7; *Chānd. Upan.*, V, 9, 8; *Bṛh. Upan.*, VI, 2, 13; etc.; etc.

188 Compare the references mentioned as "mantras", prayers, etc., in previous pages. Cook informs us in his *Zeus*, vol. II, p. 1114, that even at the present day women slide down rock in front of the church in order to propitiate Saint Marina for having children; cf. Miss M. Hamilton's *Greek Saints and their Festivals*, Edinburgh and London, 1910, p. 58f., as quoted by Cook.

189 *Ait. Brā.*, VII, 13.

191 *Op. cit.*, p. 1053.

190 *Zeus*, vol. II, 985.

192 *Op. cit.*, p. 486.

tic observances in the sacrifice, as, after this observance, she joins in other rites in the sacrifice. According to a few authorities¹⁹³ the wife should be debarred from the Sapiṇḍana if she has neither husband nor sons. Mārkaṇḍeya¹⁹⁴ thinks even though her husband may be living, unless she has any issue she is not entitled to have the Sapiṇḍana, Hemādri¹⁹⁵ thinks the mention of the son is significant of the husband and so there is no contradiction in statements of these authorities. But there is no doubt that these authorities are openly opposed to equally outstanding authorities. The *Śaṭ-trimśat-smṛti*¹⁹⁶ as interpreted by Kṛṣṇamīśra is in support of the Sapiṇḍikaraṇa being held even though the wife may be a widow as well as sonless. The *Dharma-pradīpa*,¹⁹⁷ too, as quoted by the same authority holds the same view.

Even though the authority of the first school be followed, there is no reason to think that it would be prejudicial to the high position of the wife. Under similar circumstances the limitations are the same for the wife as for the husband. If the husband is a widower as well as sonless, the Sapiṇḍana may be performed for him by his brothers' sons; otherwise it is wholly omitted. In the same circumstances the Sapiṇḍana for the wife, too, may be performed by the sons of her co-wives, otherwise the omission is as inevitable as in the case of the husband. Moreover, the object of the Sapiṇḍana is to relieve the man from the state of a man, such a state of the wife in the above circumstances will cease because of the performance of other Śrāddhas.

The woman is always pure.¹⁹⁸ Soma gives them Purity, Gandharvas sweet voice, Fire All Purity—as gifts for their enjoyment with her. The woman can by no means be contaminated.¹⁹⁹ Whatever be the sin of a wife in the meantime, it is sure to be drained out of her body and she becomes absolutely pure.²⁰⁰ Her temporary Impurity is the cause of All

193 *Paithinasi* and *Vyāsa*, as quoted by Hemādri in *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, p. 1654, l. 2-5, and 5-11.

194 सपिण्डीकरणं तासां पुत्राभावे न विद्यते ।

195 *Op. cit.*, l. 7-8.

196 *Pār. GS.*, Bom. ed., p. 504, l. 37; p. 505, l. 4.

197 *Op. cit.*, l. 6.

198 मेध्या वै योषितः सदा; *Yājñavalkya*, I, 71.

199 *Vaś. DhS.*, XXVIII, 5-6; *Baudh. DhS.*, II, 2, 4, 5.

200 *Vaś. DhS.*, XXVIII, 2-3. In mind also: *Manu* V, 108, *Viṣṇu*, XXII, 91; cf. *Mahābhārata*, XII, 165, 32.

Purity.²⁰¹ The Brāhmaṇa is pure only in the feet, but the woman is pure in all her limbs.²⁰² Her mouth is never impure.²⁰³

The stress laid by the authorities on the ritualistic impurity of women during their monthly course, pregnancy and childbirth is due to their physical incapacity or some other unavoidable cause or causes. The injunctions are all very reasonable pieces of advice and cannot at all hint at their inferiority in position.

During her period she is not in her normal state of health;²⁰⁴ authorities, therefore, make the positive rules which she should follow at that time²⁰⁵ and declare that she must not be tempted to observe any rite as it is sure to make her undergo some painstaking observance at least. Even though she may not be bodily present therein, several rites, viz., the New and Full Moon Sacrifices, the Piṇḍa-pitṛ-yajña, the daily oblations, etc., are allowed to be performed. These are allowed, simply because they would otherwise cause some hindrance, necessitate some atonement owing to the lapse of the proper time. The performance of the optional sacrifices, the Paśuyāga, the Soma sacrifice, etc., is barred in her absence. Sacrifice continues, but in spite of her absence, she gets the benefit of its performance. Kātyāyana, however, mentions that if she becomes impure during the Soma Sacrifice, she should continue wearing her Dikṣā-garments, stay in sand during the emission, and should, finally, take her baths before the Altar during the morning and evening with water mixed with cow's urine

201 *Vaś. DhS.*, XXVIII, 4; III, 58; V, 4. *Yājñavalkya*, 1, 72; *Baudh. DhS.*, II, 2, 4, 4.

202 *Vaś. DhS.*, XXVIII, 9. *Sat. Brā.*, V, 2, 1, 8 (some parts of her body to be covered with Kuśa grass) refers to the temporary Impurity and suggests an extra precaution.

203 *Yājñ.*, 1, 193; *Baudh. DhS.*, 1, 9, 2; *Viṣṇu*, XXII, 49.

204 Anton Nemilov, *Biological Tragedy of Women*, ch. VI, p. 105f.; particularly the section on "Menstruation and its significance", p. 115f. For the legendary cause of menstruation, *Tait. Samh.*, II, 5, 1; cf. *Bṛh. Up.*, 6, 4, 3; *Vaś. DhS.*, V, 5-9. Fear for unclean women in Rituals: *Sat. Brā.*, III, 1, 2, 19. Impediment to Vedic Studies, *Sān. GS.*, II, 12, 10; VI, 1, 3; cf. *Ap. DhS.*, 1, 3, 9, 13. For the various taboos on women during menstruation and childbirth among various peoples: Frazer, *Taboo*, Part II, pp. 145-156.

205 *Baudh. GS.*, 1, 7, 22ff. For exhaustive treatment: *Samśkāraratnamātā*, pp. 649-694 (various authorities have been quoted here). *Samśkāra-paddhati*, p. 40: according to this Paddhati, during her first menstruation only, she may wear garlands of yellow and scented flowers and chew betels, not in others.

(on the fourth or fifth day :²⁰⁶ as this is a śrauta sacrifice she may have her bath on either). If she is observing the impurity for childbirth, she should take her (purificatory) bath after a period of ten nights and participate in sacrifices. Some think a pregnant woman should not be initiated to the Soma sacrifice. According to the Dharma-sūtras, she may participate in the Agnihotra even within the period of impurity for childbirth. According to Baudhāyana, she may participate in the New and Full Moon sacrifices, too.²⁰⁷

If the wife is herself to perform the Śrāddha for the dead husband, and in the meantime she cannot do so for some reason or other she does it later.²⁰⁸ The wife has to cook the food to be served to the Manes. So, according to certain Authorities, if on the Śrāddha day she is impure, the Śrāddha should be performed with uncooked rice. If she has a co-wife, she might cook, but the Kalādārśa says it is improper (as cooking in the Śrāddhas is the absolute Right of the Chief Wife) and the Śrāddha should be performed on the expiry of the period of her menstruation. It is, however, sanctioned that only the Annual Śrāddha should be performed with cooked rice (which, it seems, should be cooked by the sacrificer himself) even in this case.²⁰⁹ The *Samśkāramayūkha* quotes Vṛddhagārgya to show that the Vṛddhiśrāddha may be performed during her monthly illness.²¹⁰ The above rules hold good if the wife is observing Garbhāśauca (impurity for pregnancy).²¹¹

If the sacrifices are performed in her absence, the husband, atones on the fourth night (after she has taken her purificatory bath). He tells her that half of the sacrificial merit could not be acquired on account of her absence; he is therefore atoning along with the utterance of the prescribed

206 *Samśkāra-paddhati*, p. 40, l. 20-21.

207 For the above informations: Commentary on *Āp. SS.*, IX, 2, 1, vol. II, p. 106; *Manu*, *Yājñavalkya*, *Jābali*, *Bṛhadvāja*, and *Baudhīyana*, as quoted in the above (p. 107); *Sat. SS.*, XV, 1, 39-41, vol. VI, pp. 269-71. For the Garbhini-prāyaścitta: *Āp. SS.*, IX, 20, 7, vol. II, p. 200. For the Rajasvalā wife in the Soma Sacrifice, *Sat. SS.*, vol. IV, p. 993ff.

208 *Śrāddha-sūtra-kaṇḍikā*, Par. GS., p. 466, l. 17; *Śrāddha-mañjari*, pp. 97 and 181.

209 For the varying opinions on the subject: *Śrāddha-mañjari*, p. 181.

210 p. 16.

211 Cf. *Śrāddha-mañjari*, p. 97, एवं गर्भिण्याम् अग्नि । As the eating of the middle cake is meant for pregnancy, it is only natural that during her pregnancy she is not given the same again.

mantras and praying that the merit be now acquired after the observance of the atonement.²¹²

The wife has been depicted throughout the Brahmanic literature in the loveliest colour. Sachī boasts not a little to say that her husband must conform to her will and her frame is the most precious thing to her husband.²¹³ Her pride is quite justified as in prayers to gods the seers again and again refer to her as the ideal of love, sweet relationship, etc. Vāmadeva invokes Indra with the tenderness which a husband has for his wife.²¹⁴ Atri invokes and prays to the Āśvins with the faith a wife has in her husband.²¹⁵ Viśvāmitra prays to Pūṣan to accept his offerings, listen to his thought, and be to him what a husband is to his young wife.²¹⁶ Vāmadeva prays to Indra to love his voice as the husband loves the voice of his well-beloved wife.²¹⁷

Vasu addresses some Pavamāna saying that Soma loves him just the same as a wife loves her husband.²¹⁸ When the husband goes out for fight, she orders that the generous Soma be prepared; when he has already gone, she prays to Indra for his protection.²¹⁹ The husband excites himself to all the mighty deeds with the sweet hope that she would proudly lean on his victorious arm after the victory.²²⁰ With so much influence over her husband it is only natural that she, the most blessed gift from the gods Aryaman, Bhaga, Savitṛ and Purandhī, would be the mistress of her household²²¹ having full sway over the father-in-law and others.²²² Careful and active,²²³ benevolent,²²⁴ untiring in endeavours to satisfy the husband²²⁵ by any means whatsoever—the wife, best friend of her husband²²⁶ in all her majestic glory, reserves the right of having her own favourite goddesses

212 *Āp.ŚS.* and *Sat.ŚS.* and scholiast thereon as mentioned above

213 *RV.* X, 159, 2-3.

214 *RV.* IV, 20, 5.

215 *RV.* V, 78, 4.

216 *RV.* III, 62, 8.

217 *RV.* IV, 32, 16 (3rd *Aṣṭaka*, 6th *Adh.*, *Sūkta* II).

218 *RV.* IX, 82, 4

219 *RV.* IV, 24, 8.

220 *RV.* X, 27, 12.

221 *RV.* X, 85, 36.

222 *RV.* X, 85, 46; *AV.* XIV, 2, 18.

223 *RV.* I, 66; 79.

224 *RV.* V, 61; particularly, *Ṛc.* 9.

225 *RV.* IV, 3, 2, X, 71, 4. She has no grievance even against her guilty gambling husband. She suffers in silence, but has against him neither anger nor a hard word; her love for him and goodness towards his friends are constant. The guilty husband is sorely mortified—not so much for anything else, as for making her suffer. *RV.* X, 34.

226 She is so ever since she performs the Saptapadi (the rite of taking Seven steps) during the Wedding Ceremony. *Śān. GS.*, I, 4, 5, seq.; *Gobb. GS.*, II, 2, 11;

and gods to be worshipped towards the end of the sacrifice. He would not let the sacrifice be finished unless her Agni Gr̥hapati has been satisfied with the oblation in the Patnī-samyāja. Of all gods her nearest connection with Agni is manifest. Agni enjoys her as her third God Husband.²²⁷ He is her Lover, her God²²⁸ and is the Aryaman between her and her husband and makes them one-minded.²²⁹ He brings about sexual union and causes pregnancy.²³⁰ In rituals she always sits by the side of her Fire.²³¹ We have seen her in connection with Fire-worship before:²³² beginning from her marriage when she offers the oblations for the first time down to the end of her life she worships the Fire, but the worshipper is inseparable from the worshipped;²³³ her Fire accompanies her in her death; if her husband dies before him, she gives Him (Fire) with him.²³⁴ Her fire saves her from having a co-wife.²³⁵ She herself feeds him with a log at the end of every sacrifice. So it is only natural that she would not allow the sacrifice to be finished without ceremoniously celebrating his worship. The priests, during the Patnī-samyāja, leave their respective places, come by her side, and offer various oblations to Him. She thus firmly establishes her connection with her Agni.

She also sees that the wives of gods are worshipped before the sacrifice is finished. The wives of the gods worshipped before are invoked herein to have equal share of oblations with their husbands. The sacrifice cannot be ended without the satisfaction of the wives and their human counterpart. After the Patnī-samyāja she once again partakes of the Idā; the samyu-vāc is recited and Saṁśrava oblation is offered. She concludes the sacrifice by having uttered the greetings to the priests and bidding good-bye to them.

Khā. GS., I, 5, 26; *Hiran. GS.*, I, 20, 9 seq.; *Āp. GS.*, 4, 16, etc.; etc. *Brh. Upan.*, I, 4, 3; *Ant. Brā.*, VII, 13.

227 *RV.* X, 85, 40-41; *AV.* XIV, 2, 3-4.

228 *RV.* I, 66, 8.

229 *RV.* V, 3, 2.

230 *Sat. Brā.*, III, 4, 3, 4-5; *Sān. GS.*, I, 17, 9.

231 E.g. Scholiast on *Āp. SS.*, VI, 5, 2; *Kāt. SS.*, Chow. ed., p. 274, Sūtra 193.

232 See *Indian Historical Quarterly*, March, 1940, The wife in the Vedic Ritual. For particular stress laid on fire-worship by the wife, see *Saṅkha.*, IV, 15; *Una. Samh.*, p. 409; *Kātyāyana*, XIX, 3; *op. cit.*, p. 333.

233 *Gobb. GS.*, I, 3, 15; *Khā. GS.*, I, 5, 17; *Sān. GS.*, II, 16, 3; *Gaut. DhS.*, V, 40; *RV.*, III, 53, 4; *Sat. Brā.*, III, 3, I, 10f..

234 *Karma-kāṇḍa-prādīpa*, f. 398a, l. 8ff.

235 *Āp. DhS.*, II, 5, 11, 13f.

Thus we see that in Vedic ritual the wife holds as important a position as the husband. As equal halves they perform the sacrifices with equal results. If the husband has many wives, the chief wife is, really speaking, the *patnī* in the strict sense of the term; she has many rights, in fact; all the important rights in rituals in precedence over her co-wives. Other wives (excepting *Sūdrās*) also join in the sacrifices and perform certain rites; anyway, they are not nonentities in religious matters so far as their personal earthly benefit is concerned. But the *Sūdrā* wife of an *Āryan* has no right in rituals whatsoever. Polyandry and polygamy as existing side by side in the country in varying degrees have counterbalanced each other. Both of them are, however, abnormalities as monogamy is always the ideal of the society. The Vedic ritual imposes upon the widow as well as the widower equally formidable difficulties: the same are the problems for both; they are to decide which course would be the best for them. Even in the lifetime of both, they are allowed, in extreme cases, to remarry,—however, on the full knowledge that such marriages cannot be recognised as *saṃskāras*. The Vedic ritual nowhere gives any such evidence as to lead to the assumption that the wife is to be considered inferior in position to the husband: ritualistic injunctions on her in connection with her impurities are reasonable pieces of advice and cannot suggest any the least inferiority in her position. The ritual literature is full of praise for the wife, for her virtues, and it is no wonder that the concluding oblations are offered to satisfy her most revered and beloved God Agni and the Wives of the gods, and that she concludes the sacrifice with final greetings. Every Vedic sacrifice begins with the worship of the mother (*Mātrkā-pūjā*), culminates in the worship of the wife (*Patnī-saṃyāja*) and successfully ends with the worship of the Daughter (*Kumārī-pūjā*) just in the same way as the sacrifice of man's life (*Jīvanayajña*) begins with the worship of the Mother, culminates in the worship of the Wife (*Śakti-pūjā*; *Patnī-pūjā*) and ends with the worship of the Daughter.²³⁶

J. B. CHAUDHURI

MISCELLANY

Two Religious Poems (in Marathi and Sanskrit) on the Hindu Nose-ornaments

In my studies¹ of the Nose-ornament of the Hindus so far published I have tried to establish the following points:—

- (1) The nose-ornament called *nath* could not be traced in any historical source earlier than A.D. 1000.
- (2) This nose-ornament is possibly a foreign importation into Indian culture but its foreign source or genesis has not to my knowledge been brought to light on documentary evidence by any scholar.
- (3) This nose-ornament, though foreign to Indian culture, has now become sacrosanct to such an extent that it forms part of the costume of gods and goddesses in Hindu pantheon.

In view of these conclusions already suggested by me I was in search of some texts dealing with the Nose-ornament but having a religious import. It has already been proved that the use of the nose-ornament by our women-folk has been getting more and more popular during the last 1000 years though latterly owing to modern education its use has slackened a little in certain provinces. I have found two poems in which the nose-ornament is the central theme though it is used for religious instruction in a poetic way. One of these poems is a song in Marathi by a Deccani Saint of the early 17th century while the other poem consists of 25 Sanskrit stanzas on the nose-ornament of a goddess by a possibly South Indian writer, who was obviously a devotee of this goddess. I am unable to fix the chronology of this Sanskrit poem, though its author gives some particulars about himself and his ancestors. These poems show in an admirable manner the importance that came to be attached to this late importation into Indian-female costume and the perfect innocence of the writers regarding its foreign origin.

¹ These studies are:—(1) Antiquity of the Hindu Nose-ornament called *Nath*, *Annals* (B.O.R. Institute) XIX, pp. 313-334 and (2) References to Nose-ornament in some works ascribed to Saṅkarācārya etc.—*B.I.S. Mandol Quarterly*, Poona, 1940, vol.XXI, pp. 1-9.

The Marathi poem on the nose-ornament is a *pada* or song by Keśava-svāmī who was living in Śaka 1550 = A.D. 1628 according to Mr. Vaman Daji Oka², who has edited Keśavasvāmī's *Padas*, numbering no less than 473. Mr. Oka records the following *pada* on page 266 of his edition of Keśavasvāmī's songs :—

“मार्फे नाकीचें बरवें मोती वो ! ।
 बरी फांकती निर्मळ ज्योती वो ! ॥ ध्रुवपद ॥
 शुद्ध सुवर्ण गुंफुनी सलिला ।
 सुखी मुखाचा दावीत सोहळा ॥ मार्फे ॥ ११॥
 परम सुंदर जें अतिढाळाचें
 नित्य नूतन परी बहुकाळाचें ॥ मार्फे ॥ १२॥
 बोध माणीक त्यावरी शोभतें ।
 उंची पावुनी खालतें लोंबतें ॥ मार्फे ॥ १३॥
 मुख्यलेण्यामाजी लेणें वो ।
 गुरुवत्सल मीहिला जेणें वो ॥ मार्फे ॥ ४ ॥
 प्राप्ती उदर्यी केशव लेतसे ।
 वरी सद्गुरु चुंबन देतसे ॥ मार्फे ॥ १५॥

In this *pada* the poet has used the metaphor of the nose-ornament for bringing home to the readers the beauties of spiritual instruction and understanding acquired by a devotee through sincere devotion to his preceptor. Here the nose-ornament consists of a pearl (*moti*) and a ruby (*māṇik*) set in pure gold. It is described as one of the chief ornaments of a lady. The close spiritual intimacy between a devotee and his *guru* is here depicted as that existing between a husband and his beloved wife. The poet has sustained the metaphor of the nose-ornament throughout the song. As a lady adorned with fine ornaments *appearing* before her loving husband is sure to receive his kiss, even so a loving devotee who has been adorned with spiritual understanding through his *guru* becomes capable of receiving spiritual favours from this *guru*, given but the complete self-abandonment of the devotee towards his *guru*. This appears to be the substance of the above song.

2 Vide pp. 143-290 of *Kāvya-saṅgraha* 13, A collection of Marāṭhi *Padas* by various Marāṭhi Poets, Part I by V. D. Oka, N. S. Press, Bombay, 1894. Mr. Oka states that Keśava was a Saint who hailed from Bhāgānagar (=Hyderabad, Deccan). His *guru*'s name was Kaśirāja Svāmī. He is the author of *Ekādaśī Caritra* in *Ovi* metre and several other *padas* and *abhaṅgas*. He was living in Śaka 1550. It is not known when he died. His *Samādhi* is at Gulburga. The Marathi poet Moropant refers to him in his work *Sanmanimālā*.

Whether other Indian vernacular literature contains any poem on the nose-ornament I cannot say, but I record below a Sanskrit poem which is entirely devoted to the nose-pearl or *nāsāmauktika* of the goddess *Godā*. Towards the end of the poem the poet gives us some information about himself. He calls himself “श्रीवेङ्कटेश कवि” son of “श्रीरामानुजदेशिक” and grandson of “शेषाद्विविद्वन्मणि” The title of the poem is “नासामौक्तिक पञ्चविंशति” In the Colophon the name of the author is given as “श्रीवेङ्कट निवासदास,” son of “रामानुजगुरुवर” and grandson of “शेषाचलाचार्य” an ornament of the “आवेय गोत्र”. These particulars may enable us to identify this author but this work must be left to the students of South Indian history.

The following text of the poem is based on the only manuscript available in the Govt. Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras. This MS is R No. 3872

॥ नासामौक्तिकपञ्चविंशतिः ॥

पद्मालादकरस्य पावनकरामर्शाद्विकासोन्मुखे
नित्यं षट्पदगीतचारुविभवे लक्ष्मीनिवासस्थले ।
गोदाया वदनाम्बुजे निवसतो हंसस्य लीलां श्रयन्
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥१॥
अव्याजादमृतप्रदे सुमनसां सन्मण्डलीसेविते
पङ्केष्टपटलीरुचौ विधुवनोच्चण्डोलसन्मण्डले ।
गोदावक्त्रनिशाकरेऽनुकुरुते यद्रोहिणीविभ्रमं
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥२॥
मुक्ताक्लृप्तललन्तिकासरलसत्स्वातीपथे भ्रूलता-
व्याजाभ्रालिपरीवृते रदपटीसन्ध्ये मिषत्तारके ।
गोदावक्त्रनभस्थले कलयते शंकां शशाङ्कस्य य-
न्नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥३॥
चक्षुर्नीलसरोरुहे परिलसद्भ्रूशैवले रक्षिणो
देव्या दन्तबिसाङ्गुरे मृदुहसब्बाजोच्चलद्वीचिके ।
हंसाधिष्ठितसन्निधौ बिससरो जातं मुखाख्ये हृदे
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥४॥
सीमन्ताढ्यकान्तिपूरनिपतत्कुल्योपमाया भवे-
द्देव्या रत्नललन्तिकामुखसरस्संपूरयन्ती रुचा ।
तस्याः फेनवितानमित्यनुदिनं सन्तर्कितं यौक्तिकै-
र्नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥५॥
मन्थानाचलमाकलय्य तिलकं रज्ज्वा कटाक्षालयया
नाथे मन्दहसामृतार्थमधुना बद्धादरं मथन्ति ।

मातुर्वक्त्रपयोनिधौ वितनुते यद्बुद्धस्याकृतिं
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥ ६ ॥
 कान्त्या वक्त्रनिशाकरेण विजितः पूर्णेन्दुरेत्य स्वयं
 लज्जासंकुचितात्मको वितनुते सेव्यां (वां) दृढामन्वहम् ।
 इत्थं सज्जनयन्मतिं हृदि सतां देव्या रमाधीशितु-
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥ ७ ॥
 गोदायास्तिलकाख्यपत्रवितते श्र्युग्मशाखाजुषो
 भ्रान्त्या किसलयाद्वक्त्रालवालान्तरे ।
 नासावीरुध आदधत्सुमनमद्रच्छेन सज्जायतां
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥ ८ ॥
 देव्यास्सुन्दरमन्दहासपयसि भ्रूकल्पवल्लीवृते
 रक्तेन्द्राननपूर्णचन्द्रविमलालोकाद्विवृद्धिं गते ।
 श्वेतद्वीपधियं मुखाभिधपयः पाथोनिधावादधन्
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥ ९ ॥
 गोदाया मुखपङ्कजातनिलयाजाता निजा भामिनी
 वाणी निलमितीव खिन्नमनसा संप्रेक्षिता वेधसा ।
 शंसन्ती तदुदीरितं वसति किं हंसीति शङ्कां सृजन्
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥ १० ॥
 कान्त्याऽमोदवचोमरन्दमहसा देव्या मुखाम्भोरुहा
 पाथोजं विजितं सितं प्रतिदिनं प्राप्तुं पुनस्तान्गुणान् ।
 तेनासक्लिमुपैति निश्चलतरामित्यादयन्नो धियं
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥ ११ ॥
 स्वीयाभाभरकौमुदीपरिमलद्वक्त्राम्बुजाताम्बरात्
 मीमन्ताभिधसंध्यया सह कचध्वान्तं पराकुर्वतः ।
 भासस्वादमृतोदधेरुदयतश्चन्द्रस्य शोभां भजन्
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥ १२ ॥
 नासार्वशलतोदरान्तरभवे मुक्ताफलानां गणे
 यत्पूर्वं...सुविभवं बभूव तरसा नीरन्ध्रतानिर्गतम् ।
 तद्वक्त्राब्जमलंकरोति सततं देव्या इति व्याहृतं
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥ १३ ॥
 जातश्चारुललाटचन्द्रशकले नासाप्रणाल्यन्तरा
 मन्दं मन्दमयो गलन्नवसुधाबिन्दुनिर्दोऽभवत् ।
 देव्या ओष्ठतटादितीव मतिमत्संदोहसंदेहदं
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥ १४ ॥
 मातुर्मन्दहसच्छटाच्छललसत्पाशान्वितस्य स्मरो
 नासारन्ध्रनिरुद्धमूर्तिरसृजच्छासानिले सौरभम् ।

तल्लोभेन मनोमृगः किल हरेरायात इत्यूहितं
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां संपदम् ॥१५॥
 नासाकुन्दलताजुषो नु कबरी कालिन्दि कृष्णस्य किं
 कस्तूरीतिलकच्छलस्य सुदृशां क्षौमोत्करं मुष्णतः ।
 तन्मार्गे गलितः करादध इति प्राज्ञैर्जनेर्ज्ञापितं
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥१६॥
 गोदाया मुखपङ्कजे निवसति श्रीरङ्गनाथेऽन्वहं
 साकाङ्क्षं तिलकच्छलेन पदयोस्सेवां विभोराचरन् ।
 शेषः कुण्डलितः किमित्यवधृतं धीमत्समूहैश्शुभं
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥१७॥
 कृष्णोऽस्यास्तिलकच्छलौ मुखगृहे नासाह्वयनिश्रेणिका-
 मारुद्याशु ललन्तिकामिषलसद्यन्तस्थमश्नाति यत् ।
 पाणोस्तन्नवनीतमेव गलितं भातीति संभावितं
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥१८॥
 गोदाया वदनं विधुं कुवलयामोदस्य सन्तानकं
 मत्वा लोकनिरस्ततापनिवहं श्रीविष्णुचित्तोद्भवम् ।
 अंकं तस्य समागतो नु बुध इत्यापाद(य)ल्लेपनं
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥१९॥
 रङ्गेन्द्रस्य मनो नु मूर्तिमदतिप्रेमाश्रितं दृत्यतो
 निर्गत्य प्रभुगौब वक्रनिकटं संप्राप्य संप्रेषितम् ।
 शृण्वद्वाचमिहास्त इत्यनुकलं क्लृप्तं कलावित्कुलै-
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥२०॥
 देव्याश्शारदचन्द्रमण्डललसज्ज्योत्स्नावितानोपमा
 या वक्राम्बुरुहेऽन्वहं स्मितसुधा स्रोतस्विनी दृश्यते ।
 तस्यास्तज्जनकः क्षमाश्रुदिदमित्यूहावहं धीमतां
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥२१॥
 इन्दुर्भन्दहसं विशांक्य विमलं ज्योत्स्नावितानं निजं
 देव्या वक्रसरोरुहा हृतमिति प्राप्तस्तदन्वेषितुम् ।
 आस्ते तन्निघटे किलेति कविभिर्निर्वर्णनाद्गुणितं
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥२२॥
 सूर्यालोकविक्रमं सुरभिलं शीतांशुतेजोऽसहं
 देव्यास्तामरसं विष्विन्त्य वदनं वीक्षामरम्बोत्करम् ।
 वाणी यन्मिषतोऽल्ल तिष्ठति सदेत्यालोचितं परिडत्तै-
नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥२३॥
 देव्या श्वाससमीरयोदि...शुभाऽमोदाशया पद्मगः
 कञ्चित्कुण्डलिनश्शशाङ्कसरुचि...निधलम् ।

एवं सा चिरभावितं सुमतिभिर्विद्वद्भिरुद्यत्प्रभं
 नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥२४॥
 गोदावक्त्रपयःपयोनिधितटे नखा [नासा ?] भिधाशुक्तिका
 कान्त्या सा सुभगैरतीव कबरीकादम्बिनी पूजिते ।
 मुक्तारत्नमसूत किं न्विति मुहुः प्रेक्षावदुत्प्रेक्षितं
 नासामौक्तिकमातनोतु भवतां नानाविधां सम्पदम् ॥२५॥
 श्रीरामानुजदेशिकस्य तनयः शेषाद्रिविद्वन्मयोः
 पौत्रो यामकृतेह भक्तिनिवृतः श्रीवेङ्कटेशः कविः ।
 नासामौक्तिकपञ्चविंशतिमिमां नित्यज्जपन् मानवो
 गोदापादसरोजयुग्मविषयां भक्तिं भजेत्पावनोम् ॥
 इति श्रीमदात्रेयगोत्रभूषायमाणशेषाचलान्वार्य-पौत्रेण
 श्रीरामानुजगुरुवरसूनुना श्रीवेङ्कटनिवासदासेन विरचितान्
 श्रीगोदानासामौक्तिकपञ्चविंशतिः सम्पूर्णा ।
 गोदागुणरत्नकांशे नासामौक्तिकविषयं श्लोकद्वयम् ।
 नासामणीरोहिणीं ते यतो वदनचन्द्रमाः ।
 भजत्यतो वृषन्नैव जहाति शठजित्सुते ॥
 सुखकान्तितरङ्गिण्या वहन्त्या जीवनं मम ।
 शङ्के नासातटासक्तं सैकतं नासिकामणिम् ॥
 ॥ शुभमस्तु ॥

P. K. GODE

A Prākṛit Grammar attributed to Samantabhadra

In surveying the history of Prākṛit grammar, the names of Vālmīki, Pāṇini and Samantabhadra are often mentioned; and treatises on Prākṛit grammar are traditionally attributed to them.¹ It has been shown elsewhere that it is a plain myth that Vālmīki, the author of *Rāmāyaṇa*, composed the so-called Vālmīki-Sūtras.² So far the tradition ascribing a Prākṛit grammar to Pāṇini is treated as almost incredible by scholars; and no fresh material has been brought to light to necessitate a fresh review of the position. More than once a Prākṛit grammar is attributed to

1 PISCHEL: *Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen* (Strassburg 1900), pp. 32-47;
 NITTI-DOICI: *Les Grammaires Prākṛit* (Paris 1938).

2 A. N. UPADHYE: Vālmīki-Sūtras, A Myth, *Bhāratiya Vidyā* II, ii, May, 1941

Samantabhadra³ who is assigned probably to the 3rd century of the Vikrama era and whose works like *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*, *Yuktyānuśāsana*, *Svayambhū-stotra* and *Ratna-karaṇḍaka* have come down to us.⁴ Especially his *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* has proved to be a work of great value in the history of the Indian Nyāya literature; and important commentaries like the *Aṣṭaśatī* of Akalaṅka and *Aṣṭasahasrī* of Vidyānanda are available on that text. I have lately come across a Ms. of a *Prākṛta Vyākaraṇa* of Samantabhadra,⁵ and I propose to put forth here the results of my critical study of the same and to discuss whether we are justified in attributing this work to Samantabhadra, the author of *Āpta-mīmāṃsā* and other works.

The Ms. on which this study is based belongs to the Government Collection now deposited in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. It bears the No. 96 of A 1883-84. It is a paper Ms. measuring 11.5 by 5.5 inches, and has in all 38 folios. One side of folios Nos. 1 & 38 is blank. There are 12 lines on a page with some 45 letters in each line. It is written in uniform Devanāgarī characters in black ink with thin border-lines in red ink. The hand-writing is neat, but there are many scribal errors. The Sūtras and Colophons are rubbed, at times wrongly too, with reddish chalk. But for this red chalk, it would have been very difficult to spot out the sūtras which are neither numbered nor distinguished from the commentary by any mechanism. No Daṇḍas in ink are used in the body of the text. Here and there some Daṇḍas are put with red chalk. In some places slightly more space is seen between two words. The Ms. opens with the words ओं नमः सिद्धेभ्यः and at the end it is dated संवत् १६४० । वर्ष मिति माघ वाद ५ वसंत ॥ लि० कृतं लेखक गणेशब्राह्मण गुर्जरगांडः ग्रथाग्रं

3 AUFRICHI: *Catalogus Catalogorum* p. 696; *Jaina Granthāvali* (Bombay Sanvat 1965) p. 307; JUGALKISHORE: *Svāmī Samantabhadra* (Bombay 1925), pp. 209-10. According to Pt. JUGALKISHORE, that Samantabhadra had composed a grammar is not in any way improbable because Pūjyapāda, in his *Janendra Vyākaraṇa*, has a Sūtra *catuṣṭayaṃ Samantabhadrasya*. As I understand these references and in the light of the available material, the only safe inference from this reference of Pūjyapāda is that Samantabhadra flourished earlier than Pūjyapāda.

4 JUGALKISHORE: *Svāmī Samantabhadra*, pp. 115-243; for these texts see *Sanātana Jaina Granthamālā*, vol. 1, Bombay 1905.

5 Another Ms. is reported to exist in the Asiatic Society Library of Calcutta. With the material that I have presented in this article it would be easier now to see whether the Calcutta Ms. is the same as this or not. If it is different, it deserves to be studied critically.

[hereafter a letter like थ is scratched and the following number 220 is re-written, and the word संवत् is added above between the lines, with the result that it looks like संवत् 220] २२० श्लोक ३२२० शुभं भवतु श्रास्त्व कल्याणमस्तु
From the ink it seems that the number 3220 is written later by someone who is responsible for the scratches too. The official description on the label, written in pencil, gives the age of this Ms. as Saṃvat 1840; but I think that it should be Saṃvat 1940. In all probability this copy was got specially transcribed in Saṃvat 1940 (— 57 = 1883 A.D.) for the Government Collection, and this date agrees well with the fact that the Ms. is numbered 96 of A 1883-84. Thus this Ms. is 57 years old. We have no evidence preserved here about the age of the Ms. from which this copy was transcribed in Saṃvat 1940.

There are clear indications in the text that this work claims to have been composed by Samantabhadra. First, the opening verse runs thus:

प्रणम्यादिजिनं विष्णुं संसारार्णवतारकम्⁶ ।

वक्ष्ये समन्तभद्रोऽहं प्राकृतं शब्दशासनम् ॥१॥

Secondly, the colophon at the end of the four Pādas reads:

इत्याचार्यश्रीसमन्तभद्रविरचिते प्राकृतव्याकरणे खोपज्ञशासनवृत्तौ⁷

It may be noted that the author calls himself an Ācārya; that there have been at least half a dozen authors, as shown by Pt. JUGALKISHORE,⁸ bearing the name Samantabhadra; that this author does not use the pet title Svāmi which is closely associated with Samantabhadra, the logician; and that the contents too, as shown below, do not show a high antiquity. In these circumstances, the evidence available is not enough to ascribe this grammar to Samantabhadra, the great logician.

The following points are of special interest; and would help to establish some limit for the age of this work in comparison with other Prākṛit grammars.

6 The extracts are presented here with minor corrections. The Ms. reads *jina*, and the word *viṣṇum* looks like *vidbmum*.

7 The Ms. uniformly reads *sopajña*. As to the actual readings, at the end of the 2nd Pāda (p. 22) we have *iti ācāryavyākaraṇe, sopajña-sosana-vṛttan*; at the end of the 3rd Pāda (p. 34) *iti ācārya-*; and at the end of 4th Pādā (37a) *-viracitāyām Prākṛitavyākaraṇe prāṇamaśosana-vṛttan*.

8 See his Intro. to *Ratna-karaṇḍaka-Śrāvākācāra*, Mānikachand D. Jaina Granthamālā, No. 24, (Bombay 1925) pp. 5-8.

(1) After the colophon of the first Pāda (p. 13a), the following verse appears:

यद्योर्मण्डलकुराडलीकृतधनुर्दण्डेन सिद्धाधिप
कीर्तं वैरिकुलात् तथा किल दलत् कुन्दावदातं यशः ।
भ्रान्त्वा क्षीणि जगन्ति खेदविवशं तन्मालवीनां कमा-
दापाराडौ स्तनमण्डले च धवले गण्डस्थले च स्थितम् ॥⁹

(2) Similarly at the end of the second Pāda (p. 22) we have:

द्विषत्पुरक्षोदविनोदहेतोर्भवादवामस्य भवद्भुजस्य ।
अयं विशेषो भुवनैकवीर परं न यत्काममपाकरोति ॥

(3) At the close of the third Pāda (p. 34) the verse runs thus:

ऊर्ध्वं स्वर्गनिकेतनादपि तले पातालमूलादपि
तत्कीर्तिर्भ्रमति क्षितेश्वरमणे पारे पयोधरेपि ।
तेनास्याः प्रमदास्वभावसुलभैरुच्चावचैश्चापलै-
स्ते वाचं यमवृत्तयोऽपि मुनयो मौनव्रतं त्याजिताः ॥

These three verses are identical with the verses that occur at the close of the first three Pādas of Hemacandra's Prākṛit grammar.¹⁰ The first refers to Siddhādhipa, or the king Siddharāja of Gujarat, in whom Hemacandra had a literary patron and at whose request he wrote his *Siddha-Haima-Vyākaraṇa*. This reference cannot be adequately explained in the case of Samantabhadra.

The explicit reference to king Siddhādhipa in the first verse naturally leads us to institute a critical comparison of this grammar with the Prākṛit grammar of Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.); and the results, which are set forth below, are interesting:

The Sūtras of this grammar are the same as those of Hemacandra's grammar. The first Sūtra is omitted, though its commentary is preserved. Here and there some Sūtras with the commentary are missed due to the carelessness of the scribe. Obscure portions of some Sūtras are left away (ii. 77, especially *ka* and *pa*). In the fourth Pāda, in the section of *Dhātuvādesas*, a large number of Sūtras¹¹ is simply skipped over (iv. 3-6,

• 10-11, 13-22, 160-67, 169-85, 187-94, 237-59). In the sections dealing

9 The readings *vydbāt* for *kramāt* and *sthitim* for *sthitam* given in the ed. of Hemacandra's grammar are decidedly better.

10 See the ed. of Hemacandra's grammar in the Bombay Sk. & Pk. Series, Appendix to No. LX.

11 This Ms. does not number the Sūtras. I have given these numbers according to Hemacandra's grammar.

with Saurasenī and Māgadhī many Sūtras are omitted (iv. 263-64, 266, 268-9, 272-76, 289-300). The Sūtra No. 302 is given, but the commentary thereon is not presented. After that this grammar at once goes to Sūtra No. 448. This means that the entire sections on Paiśācī, Cūlikā-Paiśācī and Apabhraṃśa are altogether dropped.

Turning to the commentary on the Sūtras, it is also identical with that of Hemacandra. Here and there some illustrations are omitted (i. 5, 80 etc.). Whenever complete verses are quoted by Hemacandra for illustration, this grammar usually selects a few words only (i. 6, 7, 8; ii. 15 etc.). At times the list of Sanskrit equivalents is not given (ii. 99 etc.) and special or optional remarks are passed over. A more thorough examination would reveal some other omissions as well.

From what I have compared it is clear that this grammar does not show any additional matter which is not found in Hemacandra's grammar.

This leads us to the conclusion that the grammar in this Ms. is a mechanical and imperfect copy of Hemacandra's grammar. Some may be tempted to argue that this grammar really belongs to Samantabhadra whose age is too ancient to include Apabhraṃśa and that the grammar of Hemacandra is only a revised edition of the older work. Such a hypothesis is least warranted by the available facts, and there are clear indications that this grammar is a post-Hemacandra production mechanically copying all that interested the compiler who cannot be identical with Samantabhadra, the great logician. The following points, which are quite apt in Hemacandra's mouth, are meaningless and irrelevant in the case of any other author.

First, the reference to king Siddhādhipa is quite justified with Hemacandra and it is a historical fact, but it is meaningless if the work were to be composed by Samantabhadra. Secondly, on ii. 172 Hemacandra refers to a sūtra of his Sanskrit grammar, and such passages when bodily copied in our work become meaningless unless Hemacandra's grammar is presupposed: Lastly, the concluding sūtra and its commentary run thus:

शेषं संस्कृतवत् सिद्धम् । शेषं यदत्र प्राकृतादिभाषाख्यमे नाहं तत्समाध्यायोनिबद्ध-
संस्कृतवदेव सिद्धम् । यथा उरस् शब्दस्य सप्तम्येकवचने उरे उरम्भि इति भवतः कचिदुर-
सीत्यपि । etc.

Here is a clear reference to the Sanskrit grammar of Hemacandra, who, we know, wrote a Sanskrit grammar in seven Adhyāyas and added a Prākṛit grammar in the eighth Adhyāya. In the case of Samanta-

bhadra all this is without proper significance. All these indications at once explode the proposed hypothesis.

The Saṃvat 220, the result of a correction in different handwriting, looks like somebody's attempt to assign the date of Samantabhadra to this work. The number of ślokaś also does not appear to be correct. We have seen that this grammar omits many portions from Hemacandra's work whose Granthāgra is 2185 ślokaś: so our text cannot claim a greater number of ślokaś. In this Ms. a page has 12 lines with some 45 letters in a line; so a page roughly contains about 18 ślokaś. In all there are 74 written pages. The number of ślokaś, therefore, would roughly amount to 1332 ślokaś: ¹² definitely not more than this. So the Granthāgra given by the Ms. is not credible. I think, the original number (of Granthas), which preceded the word ślokaś, is lost in the correction Saṃvat 220; and later the number 3220 was added after the word śloka. It is necessary that we must await the discovery of other Mss. which would clear some of the suspicious details given by this Ms.

To conclude, the Prākṛit grammar contained in the Poona Ms. and ascribed to Ācārya Samantabhadra is decidedly later than Hemacandra whose Prākṛit grammar it reproduces mechanically and bodily omitting some portions here and there; it cannot be attributed to Samantabhadra, the great logician, who flourished probably in the 3rd century of the Vikramācra; and there is no evidence at all to identify this Samantabhadra with any other Samantabhadra that might have flourished later than Hemacandra.

A. N. UPADHYE

¹² The Ms. reported to exist in the Asiatic Society at Calcutta, according to *Jaina Granthāvali*, contains 1200 Ślokaś; so it is necessary that some scholar to whom the Calcutta Ms. is easily accessible should examine its contents.

Meghasandēśa—A Note

Some light of a traditional character is thrown on the identity of the *Nāyaka* and *Nāyikā* of the *Meghasandēśa* by a verse, quoted in the *Līlātilaka*, which is a Sanskrit treatise on the grammar and rhetoric of the Malayālam language and which has to be ascribed to the second half of the fourteenth century of the Christian era. The part of the verse, having a bearing on this subject, runs as follows:

खस्रे पूर्वमहितनृपतेर्विक्रमादिख्यनाम्नः

पोक्षां चक्रे तरुणजलदं कालिदासः कवीन्द्रः ।

This verse tells us that *Kālidāsa* sent a cloud as a messenger to his beloved, who was the sister of the great king *Vikrama*. It is very legitimate to hold that the reference here is to the *Meghasandēśa*; and that means that the hero of that exquisite lyric was none other than the prince of Indian bards, while the heroine was the sister of his own patron.

This identity of the author and the hero has already been established by a Malayāli commentator of the lyric in his unpublished commentary, called *Varavarṇinī*, and he quotes this verse in further support of the position he has taken.

We have no means of deciding the authorship of this verse: it must have been a popular floating verse. The recording of this verse in a fourteenth century work has preserved for us a tradition, probably lost sight of elsewhere, which gives us some specific information regarding the hero and the heroine of the *Sandēśa* and which forms a valuable confirmation of the old tradition, associating *Kālidāsa* with the glorious *Vikrama*.

K. R. PISHAROTI

A note on the Authorship of *Āśvalāyana- gr̥hya-mantra-vyākhyā*

Manuscripts of the work had been noticed in the catalogues of the Mysore, Madras, Adyar and Trivandrum libraries for a long time. In some of them Haradatta's name is associated with its authorship. But the urgency and value of its publication were distinctly emphasized for the first time by Mr. Bhagavad Datta in his Hindi work *वैदिक-वाङ्मय का इतिहास*. He says: *हरदत्त का आश्रलायनमन्त्रभाष्य शीघ्र मुद्रित होना चाहिए* (pp. 72- vol. I, pt. 2). In pursuance of this suggestion I prepared a transcript of the ms. available at Mysore. But my attempts to secure the other mss. for collation proved futile. When I subsequently chanced to meet Dr. C. Kunhan Raja the conversation adverted to the mss. of the work concerned and Dr. Raja referred to the colophon at the end of the first adhyāya and on comparison with my transcript copy he discovered a divergence. He also informed me of the fact that the Trivandrum library had been working in the direction of publishing the work. I rested content that the work would be available within a reasonable length of time.

In 1938 Dr. Raja made certain observations on the mss. of the work in the numbers of the *Brahma Vidyā* and opined that there were probably two works of the name, one by Haradatta and the other by Cakrapāṇi.

The work recently published by the Trivandrum library possesses the same traits as those on which Dr. Raja based his observations and the learned editor has confidently ascribed it to Haradatta. This is an attempt to investigate the validity of this ascription in the light of the mss. of it available elsewhere, and other works, of Haradatta's authorship about which, no doubts have so far been entertained.

Regarding the opening verse itself, the Tr. edn. refers to an attempt on the part of 'some one' (Cakrapāṇi as mentioned in the colophon at the end of the first adhyāya) to comment on the mantras of the pākayajña karmas prescribed in *Āśvalāyana-gr̥hya*. In the first place, this opening verse entirely lacks the traits that are distinctly Haradatta's. Haradatta starts his work with obeisances to Mahādeva (cf. the Ujjvalā, the *एकाम्रिकाण्डभाष्य* and the *पैतृमेधिकमन्त्रभाष्य* referred to in the preface to the *एकाम्रिकाण्डभाष्य* p. iv by Mr. L. Śrīnivasacharya), to Rudra (cf. the *Anāvīlā*, the *Anākulā*, and the *मिताक्षरा*) or to Śiva (cf. the *Padamañjarī*). In the

first set of works the first half-śloka ग्रणिपत्य महादेवं हरदत्तेन धीमता is common. In the second set the expressions क्रियते हरदत्तेन तस्यवृत्तिः and नमो रुद्राय are common. Here it may be incidentally remarked that Dr. Winternitz erroneously reconstructs the first half of the śloka in *Anākulā* as follows: यद्गृह्यमापस्तम्बेन सूत्रकारेण निर्मितम्. He treats नमो रुद्राय which precedes यद्गृह्य as a prosaic invocation of the scribe and inserts सूत्रकारेण to fill in the gap ignoring also the fact that the metre does not satisfy the normal requirements of an अनुष्टुप्. (cf. p. vi. preface to his edn. of *Āp. Gr. Sūtra*, Vienna).

Haradatta is very orthodox and has probably greater leanings towards Siva as these verses indicate.¹ He is also accustomed to refer to himself in the opening verses themselves. The opening verse of the Tr. edn. is lacking in these features. But in the Mysore ms. the opening verse reads:

ग्रणिपत्य महादेवं हरदत्तेन धीमता । आश्वलायनसूत्र [गृह्य]स्थमन्त्रव्याख्या विधीयते ॥

In the Tr. edn. there is a companion verse where the writer solicits the learned to set right the sins of omission, commission or excess. In none of the works so far admitted to be Haradatta's is such an apologetic verse expressive of his diffidence met with. Haradatta refers to himself as धीमता and his claims are more than justified. Cf: उस का अपने आपको बुद्धिमान् लिखना अनुचित नहीं हैं [व. वा. इ. vol. I, pt. II, p. 122]. It is also noteworthy that this verse अत्युक्तानि दुर्क्तानि यान्यनुक्तानि च स्फुटम् । समादधतु विद्वान्स्तानि सर्वाणि बुद्धिभिः is found verbatim in an unpublished vṛtti on जैमिनीयगृह्यमन्त्रपाठ. Mr. Bhagavad Datta says that the name of the author remains undiscovered. He is posterior to Bhavatrāta, the famous ācārya of the Jaiminiya Śākhā of the Sāmaveda since he invokes him in the opening verse. That he was a Vaiṣṇava is also pretty clear (cf. व. वा. इ. vol. I, pt. 2, p. 252-3).

In the Tr. edn. the work starts with a learned disquisition on the importance of mentioning the ṛṣi, devatā and chandas of the mantras. Then follows the commentary on the first mantra. In a parallel work, the *Ekāgnikāṇḍabhāṣya*, Haradatta just draws attention to the context of a mantra (including the first), and proceeds to comment on it. In the commentaries to mantras like त्वमर्यमा भवसि, यन्मामि ते, प्र वा सुश्रामि etc. which are common to the *Ekāgnikāṇḍa* and *Āśvalāyanagrhya*. He does not mention the ṛṣi, devatā or chandas. But in the Tr. edn. we get references to them under all these mantras. In the Mysore manuscript the commentator

1 वैदिक वाङ्मय का इतिहास, vol. I, pt. 2, p. 122.

incidentally refers to some of them, e.g., under इष एकपदी we notice ता एतास्सप्तानुष्टुभः । It is not a hard and fast rule with him. On the other hand, the Tr. commentator is not himself consistent when he fails to give them under अग्निमीरे पुरोहितम् (p. 168). In this context the Mysore ms. gives मधुच्छन्दाः. We have so far noticed how the opening and the method are against the ascription of the Tr. edn. to Haradatta.

The निगमन or colophon also confirms this conclusion. In none of Haradatta's other works do we come across a metrical colophon. But in the Tr. edn. the colophon at the end of the first adhyāya reads: आश्वलायन-गृह्योक्तपाकयज्ञेषु कर्मसु। मन्त्रा ये विनियुक्तास्ते व्याख्याताश्चयक्रपाणिना ॥ But the colophons at the end of the other three adhyāyas are not metrical and do not contain the name Cakrapāṇi. The circumstances that would account for a metrical colophon or the motive for an alternative appellation for Haradatta (cf. the preface to the Tr. edn.) are not clear. With his Śaivaite leanings as indicated by the opening verses of all his other works, it would be difficult to establish a conversion to Vaiṣṇavism and the consequent rechristening as Cakrapāṇin.

A comparison of the contents of the Tr. edn. with as much of them as are available in the Mysore ms. and with Haradatta's *Anāvīlā* lends further support to this viewpoint. The commentaries to certain mantras, as found in the Tr. edn., are positively divergent from the hints to interpretation contained in the *Anāvīlā*. For example (1) the mantra यस्मिष्ठा etc. •

Tr. Edn.	Anāvīlā
1. समिधा, आहुती, वेदेन तृतीया द्वितीयाथे	1. समिधा, आहुती, वेदेन are all only तृतीयान्तः
2. अग्नये is a चतुर्थ्यन्त	2. अग्नये=अग्निम्-विभक्तिव्यत्ययः
3. ददाश=ददाति	3. दाश-दाशतिर्दानकर्मान्यत्र, इह तु प्रीणने द्रष्टव्यः, प्रीणाति
4. स्वध्वरः=सोमयागः	4. स्वध्वरः=शोभनयज्ञः

The interpretation of ददाश as equal to प्रीणाति is justified later on in the *Anāvīlā* with the statement दाशतिः प्रीत्यर्थ इत्यनेन दर्शितम् विद्ययैवाप्यस्ति प्रीतिः (cf. p. 5. *Anāvīlā*). The Mysore ms. agrees with the *Anāvīlā* in toto. It explains वेदेन as equal to मन्त्रब्राह्मणात्मकेन which is found in the *Āpastamba-paribhāṣā-sūtra* (I. 32. मन्त्रब्राह्मणयोर्वेदनामधेयम्] which Haradatta was sure to know as its commentator.

Except that the commentary in the Mysore ms. is clearer and more copious inasmuch as it embodies material relating to Vedic grammar, there is no divergence between it and the *Ekāgnikāṇḍabbāṣya*. In these circumstances it would be unfair to expect any author to repeat himself verbatim by way of proof of identity of authorship. The divergences between the Tr. edn. and the *Ekāgnikāṇḍabbāṣya* are too clear to be commented upon.

Moreover, the commentator in the Tr. Edn. has incorporated into his work much of the material of the sūtras. E.g. in the commentary to the first mantra itself we get समिधमेवापि श्रद्धधानोऽग्नावादधद्यो मन्येत and यज्ञो वै नम इति हि ब्राह्मणं भवति (*Āś. Gr.* I. 1. 5) while in the *Ekāgnikāṇḍabbāṣya* which is parallel to the present work Haradatta refers to the sūtras only to draw attention to the context in which the mantra taken up for comment is to be recited. He does not quote the sūtras in extenso while commenting on the text of a mantra. Haradatta's work, as it is represented by the Mysore ms., is supplementary to the *Anāvīlā*. It does not encroach upon its province, e.g., the words वनस्पतये, स्वाहा and धन्वन्तरये are not explained in the *Anāvīlā* (I ii. 1) while the Mysore ms. in the context concerned reads:

वनस्पतये ओषध्यादिभिर्निबिडस्य वनस्य सोमः पतिः, स्वाहाशब्दः प्रदानार्थः, धन्वन्तरिर्वध्वजः । अमृतोद्भवश्चिकित्सितस्योपदेष्टा.

The foregoing observations are, it is hoped, enough to warrant the conclusion that the works concerned cannot claim identity of authorship. It may not be out of place here to draw attention to a few more features of the Tr. edn. as compared with the ms. of the work in the Madras Mss. Library. In spite of innumerable scribal errors the readings in the Madras ms. (4193) are preferable to those in the Tr. edn.

(1) P. 58, line 16. Tr. edn. After घृतवत्ता the Madras ms. has घृतशब्दोऽलान्तर्णीतरयर्थः . It seems to be necessary in view of the following उपस्तोर्णाभिधारितेनेत्यर्थः .

(2) P. 64, line 9. Tr. edn. for अवशब्द the Madras ms. reads अथवा शशब्दः . The Ms. is right in view of अस्मिन् पक्षे and the alternative meaning 'करोति' for 'भवति' suggested later.

(3) P. 65, line 5. Tr. edn. The Madras ms. has अग्नि' after केवलम् and आत्मनस्सुखमिच्छन्तौ found in the Tr. edn. is missing. The Ms. is right.

(4) P. 67, Line 10-11. Tr. edn. The Madras ms. has stoppages after शक्तिर्न and तर्हि and सामर्थ्यात् instead of सामर्थ्यम्. The reading in the ms. is definitely better.

It would be improper if I failed to draw attention to the outstanding features of the Mysore ms. It contains a big lacuna (which amounts to 140 pages of matter in the Tr. edn. pp. 27-167) within which the colophons at the end of the first and second adhyāyas will fall. It is very unfortunate that the reference to Udghitācārya noticed by Dr. Raja in his ms. notes and found in the Tr. edn. (p. 67) falls within this lacuna. Moreover, the statement भूतान्येवमन्तानोत्थं मन्त्रो न भवतीति शुद्धव्याख्याने वयमवोचाम referred to by Dr. Raja and found in Tr. edn. (p. 167) is missing in the Mysore ms. though there is no lacuna at the particular point. But the Tr. edn. does not display great divergence from the Mysore ms. in the portion from p. 168 onwards.

To sum up, it is certain that the commentary on the first adhyāya of the Tr. edn. can be only by Cakrapāṇi and not by Haradatta. Cakrapāṇi started with the modest ambition of commenting on the Pākayajña mantras and congratulated himself on his achievement as warranted by the opening verses and the colophon at the end of the first adhyāya. Whether the II adhyāya of the Tr. edn. is by Haradatta cannot be determined in the absence of indubitable ms. evidence. The commentary on the III and IV adhyāyas in the Tr. edn. shows no radical divergences from the Mysore ms. The Tr. edn. has thus offered to readers a hotchpotch consisting of an imperfect text of Cakrapāṇi's commentary on the I adhyāya and probably an equally defective text of Haradatta's commentary on the rest. Such imperfect execution is probably due to a reluctance to borrow from, or lend to, others, or both.

M. LAKSHMINARASIMHAIAH

REVIEWS

HISTORY OF MADRAS by Rao Sahib Srinivasachari, M.A., Professor of History, Annamalai University. P. Varadachary & Co. Madras.

This is an excellent book on Madras. It traces the history of the growth of the town of Madras from its foundation to the present day. In 1639 Francis Day obtained a grant of the village from the Raja of Chandragiri through the good offices of the Damarla brothers. Ultimately the British abandoned Masulipatam and made Madras the seat of the Presidency. Incidentally, it was their first territorial acquisition in India, if we leave out the insignificant fort at Armgaon.

The town had a chequered career. It was threatened by Mir Jumla and the rulers of Golconda. It was captured by La Bourdonna in 1746 and remained in French hands till 1749. Lally besieged it unsuccessfully for 3 months (December 1758—February 1759) and Haidar Ali raided it twice. The town however continued to grow in area and population until it assumed its present dimensions.

The book is an able and scholarly production and contains much valuable and interesting information. Very few people are aware of the facts that Yale University in America is named after a Governor of Madras. Thomas Pitt, the grandfather of the "Great Commoner" was originally an "interpreter" but was subsequently appointed Governor. He acquired the famous Pitt diamond. There was Pigott, who twice became Governor, but was during his last term imprisoned by the majority of the Council and died a prisoner. Mention may also be made of Munro, one of the greatest of British administrators of India, who introduced the Ryotwary system and pleaded for entrusting Indians with responsible offices. Another Governor Trevelyan had the temerity to criticise publicly the financial policy of the Government of India as revealed in the budget of Sir James Wilson, the Finance Member. He was promptly recalled but two years later was curiously enough appointed the Finance Member of the Governor-General's Council, because the views that he had expressed were quite sound.

The book was written on the occasion of the Madras Tercentenary celebrations, and is one of the best books on Indian history published in recent times. The author has dealt with the subject with admirable

thoroughness and has given us a picture not only of the political and territorial history of Madras but also of its administrative, judicial and social aspects at various periods.

Mr. Srinivasachari needs no introduction to students of history and the book is quite worthy of him.

I may point out a slight printing mistake. On page 220, the date of the Governorship of Munro should be upto 1827 and not '1927'.

S. K. DUTT

THE DIN-I-ILAH, by Prof. Makhan Lal Roy Choudhury, M.A., P.R.S., Sastri, of T. N. J. College, Bhagalpur. Published by Calcutta University, 1941.

Every serious student of medieval Indian history knows that V. A. Smith's *Akbar* gives a very unsatisfactory account of that great Emperor's career; yet, strangely enough, no scholar has yet come forward to fill up the gap. Sarkar, Moreland, Ibn Hasan, Tripathi and Saran have dealt with some aspects of administrative history, but a complete and accurate account of Akbar's career yet remains to be written. We are reliably informed that Sir Jadunath Sarkar has taken upon himself the task of writing the volume on Akbar in the *National History of India Series*. We are awaiting its publication with eager interest.

The volume under review is a clear, exhaustive and thought-provoking account of one important aspect of Akbar's career, viz., his religious views and policy. The author has made a thorough study of contemporary Persian and Portuguese materials. He has successfully exposed the orthodoxy of Badauni and his perverted jealousy of Faizi and Abul Fazl. He has also questioned the reliability of the Jesuit stories, on which V. A. Smith put so much emphasis. We believe all readers of this book will unhesitatingly accept the author's conclusion about Badauni and the Jesuits. The author has made full use of the *Dabistan* with a mild warning that the writer was blessed with a romantic temperament.

The narrative is logical and convincing. Akbar's religious views cannot be properly understood unless they are explained with reference to the age in which he lived. In two interesting and well-written chapters Prof. Roy Choudhury has explained the forces which came from Central Asia and the process of cultural fusion in India which culminated in Akbar's days.

He shows how Akbar passed through Shia and Sunni influences and ultimately found his salvation in Sufism. He argues that the so-called 'Infallibility Decree' was really a political measure, a proclamation of Akbar's freedom from the religio-political pretensions of Persia and Turkey. The reviewer cannot accept this conclusion, but Prof. Ray Choudhury's arguments cannot be lightly set aside. The author's final conclusion is that Akbar never renounced Islam. He tries to show that the so-called anti-Islamic decrees were not religious measures calculated to injure Islam; they were rather political measures intended to crush rebels. He also points out many similarities between the principles of the Din-i-Ilahi and Sufism. The book is a very valuable contribution to Indian history.

A. C. BANERJEE

TRISASTĪSALĀKĀPURUSACARITRA. Vol. II, Translated into English by Helen M. Johnson, Ph.D. Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. LXXVII. Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1937.

We extend our hearty welcome to the second volume of the translation of Hemacandra's celebrated work on Jain mythology and folklore, published half a decade after the appearance of the first which was reviewed in these pages in 1932 (VIII. 409-11). This brings the work up to the end of the third of the ten Books into which it is divided. Actually it completes half of the work which is proposed to be finished in four volumes in all. We are however afraid that the world war will retard the smooth progress of the second half of the work which may take even a longer period than the first, though a wide circle of readers will be eagerly looking forward to its speedy publication. The work has its appeal not only to the Sanskritist or the Jinologist alone but also to students of folklore, if not the cultured people in general. This is perhaps shown by the response given to Jacobi's English translation of the *Śthavirāvalīcarita* or supplement to the present work, of which two editions have been published by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. Among topics of general interest in this volume reference may be made to versions of well-known stories (e.g., one dealing with the destruction of 60000 sons of Sagara and another giving an example of the Solomon's Judgment motif).

The learned translator has not spared any pains to make the translation useful to all concerned. In this connection reference may be made to

various auxiliary matters in the work, e.g., the learned footnotes, the three appendices, the two indices and the long list of textual corrections and emendations. Appendix I gives additional notes including information not available when the body of the book was being printed. Appendix II seeks to clarify the significance of botanical terms, especially to non-Indian readers. Appendix III proposes to give a list of new and rare words in the work and their meanings. Many of these, however, (e.g., *adūṣya*, *anirviṇṇa*, *anudghāta*, *andhatamasa*, *abhayada*, *avakratā*, *āśrutapūrva*, *ubhe*, *kālākṣepa* etc.) have no novelty for Indian Sanskritists. The index of names and subjects draws attention, *inter alia*, to a number of interesting items dealt with in the book. Another index gives a list of Sanskrit and Prakrit (or rather vernacular) words used in the course of the translation. The text-corrections based on the collation of a number of mss. will be useful when a critical edition, the want of which is keenly felt, comes to be undertaken. But it is somewhat unfortunate that the actual sources of particular readings are not definitely indicated.

CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI

AUNĀDIKAPADĀRṆAVA of PERUSŪRI. Edited by T. R. Chintamani M.A., Ph.D., Senior Lecturer in Sanskrit, University of Madras. Madras University Sanskrit Series, No. 7., Part 4. University of Madras, 1939.

The *Aunādikapadārṇava* which forms the fourth volume of the Series of treatises on the Uṇādi Sūtras entitled 'Uṇādi Sūtras in various Recensions' is a very interesting and valuable work. Its principal object is to explain in a metrical form, under every uṇādi sūtra of the Paninian School, the meanings of words that could be formed with the help of it and to draw attention to the various peculiarities noticed in the use of the word and its derivatives in different grammatical functions. Occasionally it discusses in short prose lines the prevalent readings of the sūtras and incidentally points out variant readings as accepted by predecessors or contemporaries of the author. Unfortunately the manuscript material on which the edition is based is insufficient and incomplete, running as far as the middle of the fourth pāda. There are lacunae and obscurities which are difficult to be cleared up. The learned editor has, however, spared no pains to suggest emendations wherever possible. He has also identified in the foot-

notes the various references to the sūtras of Pāṇini and the commentaries thereon, as also to a number of the many other works referred to in the body of the text. The volume under review follows the plan and maintains the standard of its predecessors of which we had the privilege of reviewing the first two numbers in the pages of the *Modern Review* (October, 1935). We eagerly wait for the remaining two volumes which, it is understood, will complete this interesting Series of publications of immense linguistic interest, undertaken by Dr. Chintamani.

CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI

THE NUMBER OF RASAS by V. Raghavan M.A., Ph.D. Adyar Library, Adyar, 1940, Demy 8 vo, pp. xxii + 192.

Of the three schools of ancient Indian literary criticism that taking *rasa* as the soul of poetry, is perhaps the most widely known and generally followed. This may be the reason why this *rasa* school in course of time gave rise to what are to be styled as various sub-schools of it. But this subdivision had behind it no question other than that of the number of *rasas*, which as we know from the earliest available writer of it (the author of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*), was at first only eight. Successive writers on *rasa* however invented gradually *rasas* like *śānta*, *preyas*, *vātsalya* and *bhakti* etc. and formed several subschools according as they recognized the total number of *rasas*. In the volume under review Dr. Raghavan has very diligently collected and discussed materials to show the evolution of the *rasa* school of ancient Indian literary criticism. As this collection has been pretty well exhaustive and includes quotations from some works hitherto unpublished the present work will be of great help to a critical student of the history of ancient Indian literary criticism.

MANOMOHAN GHOSH

SANSKRIT POETESSES, Part A (Select Verses). With a Supplement on Prakrit Poetesses. Edited with critical notes, etc. by Prof. Dr. Jatindra Bimal Chaudhuri, PH.D. (LONDON). English Translation and Introduction by Prof. Dr. Roma Chaudhuri, M.A., D.PHIL. (OXON). Foreword by Dr. L. D. Barnett, C.B., M.A., D.LITT., F.B.A. Second edition, Calcutta, 1941. The Contribution of Women to Sanskrit Literature, Vol. II. Published by the Author from 3, Federation Street, Calcutta.

We welcome the second edition of the work within so short a time. In this edition Dr. Mrs. Chaudhuri deals in the Introduction not only with Sanskrit and Prakrit Poetesses but also with the Female Vedic seers and Buddhist theris. She compares these various groups of Indian Poetesses and throws much light upon their respective trends of thought and style.

In this edition it is further shown that out of 140 Sanskrit verses collected here the authorship of only fourteen of them may be disputed. All the other verses are found in a large number of Mss. of anthological and rhetorical works assigned to the same Poetesses as in this work and there is no scope for any doubt about their authorship.

The text is mostly prepared from a large number of Mss. deposited in various Libraries in India and abroad. Some exceptionally valuable Mss. have been used in this connection. Mss. in Southern Indian scripts have been usefully utilised. One may imagine what a huge number of Mss. Dr. Chaudhuri had to wade through in order to find out the several Mss. that ultimately proved useful to him. In his usually thorough manner Dr. Chaudhuri has published this edition. His critical notes are exhaustive and useful. The Translation is faithful and accurate. The elucidation of knotty parts of the verses, the exposition of double *entendres*, the identification of ancient names, etc. make the third part of the book a valuable contribution.

The Appendices enhance the importance of the book and the Bibliography is a mine of information.

Dr. Chaudhuri and Dr. Mrs. Chaudhuri deserve the congratulations of all scholars.

AMARESWAR THAKUR

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Adyar Library Bulletin, vol. V, pt, III

- P. K. GODE.—*The Oldest Dated Manuscript of Puṇjarāja's Commentary on the Sārasvataprakriyā*—Dated A.D. 1556 (Samvat 1612).
- H. G. NARAHARI.—*The Dates of Caturvedasvāmin and Rāvaṇa: Two Commentators on the R̥gveda*. Caturvedasvāmin wrote between 1477 A.C. and 1507 A.C., and Rāvaṇa lived earlier than the middle of the 15th century A.C.

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,
vol. XXII, pts. I-II

- R. C. HAZRA.—*The Kālikāpurāṇa*. Facts have been adduced to show that the extant *Kālikāpurāṇa* is different from the original work of that name quoted by early writers. The earlier *Purāṇa*, written between 650 and 750 A.C., was of a non-tantric character. The present *Kālikāpurāṇa* which had not been known to Bengal before the 13th century A.C. appears to have been composed in the region of Kāmarūpa and contains a large amount of Tantric elements in its rituals. It may be a work of the tenth or the eleventh century A.C.
- P. K. GODE.—*The Rôle of the Courtesan in the Early History of Indian Painting*.
- N. A. GORE.—*Jagaddhara's Indebtedness to Harihara—An Ancient Commentator of the Mālatīmādhava*. Jagaddhara's celebrated commentary on Bhavabhūti's *Mālatīmādhava* contains a large amount of borrowings from the earlier commentary of Harihara of the early 13th century.
- SHAIKH CHAND HUSAIN.—*When and where was Ferishta born?* Ferishta's father Ghulām Āli Hindū Shāh came in 1553 A.C. from Astrabad to Ahmadnagar where Ferishta was born in the year A.H. 980 (1570-71 A.C.).
- M. A. CHAGHTAI.—*Indo-Muslim Architecture*.
- B. C. LAW.—*Some Ancient Indian Tribes*. The note contains information regarding the Anūpas, Kīkaṭas, Tukharas, Kukuras and Ugras as found in the literature of ancient India.
- HAR DUTT SHARMA.—*Hāsya as a Rasa in Sanskrit Rhetoric and Literature*.

Bhāratīya Vidyā, vol. III, pt. 1 (November, 1941)

- A. D. PUSALKAR.—*Indus Civilisation*. It is mainly a description of the sites ✓ and buildings discovered at Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro.
- A. S. GOPANI.—*Ājīvika Sect—A New Interpretation*. Originally the sect of Ājīvikas was known as Maskarins or Ekadaṇḍins carrying a bamboo-staff as its symbol. The designation Ājīvika might have been due to the employment of some specific means of livelihood (ājīvikā) by the members of the sect. Gośālaka, a leading Ājīvika in the time of Mahāvīra, was a scheming man making the sect unpopular by the preachings of the illogical theories.
- A. N. UPADHYE.—*Siricimḍhakavvaṃ of Kṛṣṇatīlāśuka*. *Siricimḍhakavva* (= *Śricihnakāvya*) is a Prakrit poem (still in manuscript) by Kṛṣṇatīlāśuka known also as Kodaṇḍamaṅgala or Vilvamaṅgala, who flourished at the close of the 13th century A.C. Kṛṣṇatīlāśuka had composed the first eight cantos of the poem to which his pupil Durgāprasāda Yati added four more, writing also a commentary in Sanskrit on the entire work. The word *siri* occurring in the last stanza of each of the twelve cantos of the work is responsible for its title *Siricimḍhakavva*. Written with the specific purpose of illustrating the rules of Vararuci's *Prākṛta-prakāśa*, the poem delineates events in the early life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. No definite proof is available as to whether this Vilvamaṅgala is identical with the author of the *Kṛṣṇakarnāmṛta* and the *Puruṣakāra*.
- S. D. GYANI.—*Ancient India and the Outer World*. This is a brief account of the spread of Indian culture both in the east and the west from the earliest times down to the tenth century of the Christian era.

Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute,
vol. II, nos. III & IV (1941)

- H. D. SANKALIA.—*Monuments of the Yādava Period in the Poona District*.
- A. V. NAIK.—*Studies in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa Sculptures*. The paper deals with the general architecture, different articles of furniture, toys, musical instruments, and various weapons of offence and defence found at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa.
- T. S. SHEJINALKAR.—*The Bengal Episode in Maratha History*. The writer tries to show that the Maratha invasion of Bengal was not so rapacious in character as is generally regarded. •

Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient,

Tome XL, Fasc. II (1940)

K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI.—*Śrī Vijaya*. Colonised by Indians at an early period, Śrī Vijaya-Palembang in the Sumatran Archipelago became the centre of a great Indonesian power in the 7th century A.C. The article deals with the history of the kingdom of Śrī Vijaya in its beginnings and gives an account of its growth and activities in the 8th, 10th and 13th centuries when it began to lose its greatness.

PAUL LÉVY.—*Les traces de l'introduction du bouddhisme à Luang Prabang*.

Jaina Vidya, vol. I, no. 2 (October, 1941)

KALIPADA MITRA.—*Dreams in Jaina Literature*.

S. SRIKANTHA SASTRI.—*Jain Epistemology*.

KAMTA PRASAD JAIN.—*The Rattas of Saundatti and Jainism*. The Rattas related to the Imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭas ruled under the latter as feudatory chiefs between 850 and 1250 A.C. at Saundatti, now a village in the district of Belgaum in the Bombay Presidency. Under the Rattas Jainism flourished, but the doctrine of Ahimsā had no emasculating effect upon its followers, who proved themselves excellent warriors.

S. M. KATRE.—*The Importance of Jaina Literature for Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics*. Emphasis has been laid upon the study of the voluminous compositions of the Jaina bards and the vast number of the Jaina commentaries that are rich in dialectical varieties and other Middle Indo-Aryan characteristics.

BANARSI DAS JAIN.—ब्राह्मण-पुराणों के अनुसार जैनधर्म की उत्पत्ति (The Origin of Jainism according to the Brahmanical Purāṇas).

Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society,
vol. XIII, pt. II (July, 1941)

M. SOMASEKHARA SARMA.—*A Study of the Grants of the Early Gāṅgas*.

Journal of the Annamalai University, vol. XI, no. 1 (September, 1941)

N. V. MALLAYA.—*Studies in Sanskrit Texts on Temple Architecture with Special Reference to the Tantrasamuccaya*.

Journal of the Assam Research Society, vol. VIII, no. 3 (July, 1941)

B. K. BARUA.—*A Short Note on Śrībastamuktāvalī*. The Sanskrit text is being published in the journal with English translation. It is a

treatise on hand-poses compiled by Subhankara from well-known works on the subject like the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata.

PREMDHAR CHOWDHURY.—*The Hindu Deities and their Iconographical Representations.*

Journal of the Benares Hindu University, vol. 6, no. 1

RAJ BALI PANDEY.—*The Vivāha Samskāra of the Hindus.* Significance attached to the marriage ceremony by the Hindus, its importance in the social structure, the origin of the institution and the forms of marriage recognised as valid in the ancient Hindu society are some of the topics discussed in the paper.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society,
vol. XXVII, pt. III

- A. BANERJI-SASTRI.—*India Beyond the Ganges.* Translated with notes from the original German of Lassen's *Indische Alterthumskunde*.
S. C. SARKAR.—*Notes on a Tibetan Account of Bengal.*

Journal of the Greater India Society, vol. VIII, no. 2 (July, 1941)

JEAN PRZYLUSKI.—*The Shadow Theatre in Greater India and in Greece.*

R. C. MAJUMDAR.—*Political Relations of Tibet with India.* Materials found in Tibetan and Chinese texts lead to the conjecture that Tibetan kings invaded and brought under subjugation parts of India at different times between the close of the 6th and the beginning of the 9th century of the Christian era.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH.—*Varuṇa.* This religio-philological study analyses and discusses the ideas associated with the name of Varuṇa and its equivalents found in the Vedic and many other languages.

HIMANSU BHUSAN SARKAR.—*Glimpses of the Hindu-Javanese Society of Central Java*—(from the middle of the seventh to the early part of the tenth century A.D.).

Journal of Indian History, vol. XX, pt. 2 (August, 1941)

BAIJ NATH PURI.—*Nāga Worship in the Kushana Period.*

N. B. ROY.—*The Transfer of Capital from Delhi to Daulatabad.* Considerations that might have weighed with Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq in transferring his capital from Delhi to Daulatabad have

been discussed, specially his religious zeal for propagating Islam in the south. Evil effects of this wild experiment of the Sultan have also been dealt with.

ANIL CHANDRA BANERJI.—*Peshwa Madhav Rao, I and the Nizam (1761-1763)*.

Journal of the Madras University, vol. XIII, no. 2 (July, 1941)

- K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI.—*Nālandā*. The importance of Nālandā as a cultural institution and the influence that it exerted on the Buddhist thought and religion have been emphasised.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal,

Letters, vol. VII (1941), no. 1

- M. I. BORAH.—*The Life and Works of Amir Hasan Dīhlavi*. Hasan was a great Indo-Persian poet in the time of 'Alā u'd-Dīn Khaljī in the early fourteenth century.
- N. B. ROY.—*Futūḥāt-i-Firūzshāhī*. Sultān Firūzshāh Tughlaq composed a brief narrative of the events of his reign and had it engraved on the walls. This historical work in Persian has been edited here.
- P. C. SENGUPTA.—*The Solar Eclipse in the Ṛgveda and the Date of Atri*. The reference to a solar eclipse in a Ṛgvedic hymn by Atri has been discussed to show that the said eclipse occurred on the 26th of July in 3928 B.C. when Atri lived 'in a cave of a hundred openings at the bottom of a snow-capped peak either of the Himalayas or of Karakoram range.'
- W. J. CULSHAW.—*Some Beliefs and Customs relating to Birth among the Santals*.



Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland,
1941, pt. III

- E. H. JOHNSTON.—*Two Notes on Ptolemy's Geography of India*.

(i) DOUNGA, a trade centre mentioned by Ptolemy in his *Geography of India* seems to have been a seaport perhaps on the island of Salsette. DOUNGA is inferred to have been identical with the Dhenukākāṭa of the inscriptions and Dongri of the present day. The prosperity of this market-place grew when it was in Śaka hands.

(ii) Ptolemy's description of the internal mountain ranges of India leads to the conjecture that he has used Greek renderings of a recension of the *Brahmapurāṇa* for his authority.

E. H. C. WALSH.—*Notes on the Silver Punch-marked Coins, and Copper Punch-marked Coins, in the British Museum.*

M. S. RAMASWAMI AIYAR.—*Bibliography of Indian Music.*

W. RUBEN.—*The Purāṇic Line of Heroes.* A comparison of the accounts of the Sambhavarparvan of the *Mahābhārata* on the one hand, and the Vamśaparvans of the *Harivaṃśa*, and the *Brahma* and other *Purāṇas* on the other, shows that the *Brahmapurāṇa* has borrowed from the *Harivaṃśa* which is an imitation of the *Mahābhārata*.

Journal of the Sind Historical Society, vol. V, no. 3 (November, 1941)

N. M. BILIMORIA.—*The Jats, a Tribe in Sind.*

C. L. MARIWALLA.—*Ancient Sind Civilisation as known from Recent Archaeological Excavations.* The discussion in the paper includes the following topics: Chronology of ancient cultural sites in Sind, authors of the Indus civilisation, buildings, civic amenities, food, clothing, personal decoration, tools and implements, toys and games, arts and crafts, art of writing, religious beliefs, and the extent of Chalcolithic civilisation.

**Journal of the Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute,
vol. II, pt. 1 (January-June, 1941)**

T. K. GOPALASWAMI AIYENGAR.—*Upavarṣa and Bodhāyana.* The writer of this paper affirms the much discussed identity of Upavarṣa and Bodhāyana known also by the name Kṛtakoti, who wrote *Vṛttis* both on the Pūrvamīmāṃsā and the Uttarmīmāṃsā systems of philosophy as can be gathered from the statements of Śabaravāmin and Śaṅkarācārya. New textual evidence has been adduced in support of the identification.

N. AIYASWAMI SASTRI.—*Central Teachings of the Manimekhalai.* *Maṇimekhalai*, the well-known Tamil classic poem has introduced in it discussions on various precepts and doctrines of Buddhist ethics and philosophy. The discourse of the sage Aṣvaṇa to the heroine embodied in the two sections of the poem contains instructions on the correct means of knowledge and their fallacies, and explains the theory of causation. The contents of the second section relating to the theory

of causation have been interpreted in this paper in the light of writings on the subject in Pali and Sanskrit literature.

- M. RAMKRISHNA KAVI.—*Utpala-parimalam*. The *Utpala-parimala* is a commentary on the *Brhatsaṃhitā*, the celebrated astrological work of Varāhamihira. The commentator Yogin or Yogīśvara completed his work at Śrīraṅga in the year 966 A.C.
- T. K. V. N. SUDARSANACHARYA.—*Some Parallel Concepts of Jainism and Vedānta*.
- N. AIYASWAMI SASTRI.—*A Commentary on the Sāṅkhyakārikā in Chinese*. The writer contends that the anonymous commentary in Chinese appended to Paramārtha's Chinese rendering of *Sāṅkhyakārikā* could not be a translation of the *Mātharavṛtti* as has been supposed by some.
- I. V. VIRA RAGHAVACHARYA.—*Ancestry and Date of the Sanskrit Dramatist Vātsya Varadācārya*. Varadācārya, who wrote the *Blāṇa* play *Vasanta-tīlaka* and the allegorical drama *Yātūrājavijaya*, flourished in Conjeevaram in the 14th century and was a descendant of Rāmānujācārya.
- S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR.—*The Vedanārāyaṇaperumāl Inscription: Ānūr*. The inscription engraved on the walls of a temple in the village Ānūr in the Chingleput district records a grant of provision for learned men (Bhāṭṭavṛtti). The Bhāṭṭas entitled to the Vṛtti were required to be competent in teaching among other subjects the Mīmāṃsā in twenty chapters. This shows that the term Mīmāṃsā denoted, at the time of this inscription (999 A.C.), the 12 chapters now recognised as the Pūrvamīmāṃsā proper, the 4 chapters of the Uttarmīmāṃsā and the 4 chapters of the so-called Saṃkarṣaṇakāṇḍa.
- K. SATAKOPACHARYA.—*न्यायकलापः*. The *Nyāyakalāpa*, also called *Nyāyaka-lāpasamgraha* or *Nyāyasamgraha* is a compilation giving in 220 stanzas the summaries of the topics (adhikaraṇārtha) discussed in the *Śrībhāṣya*. The author Senānātha or Senēśvarārya flourished at the beginning of the 12th century A.C.
- T. VIRARAGHAVACHARYA.—*वैशेषिकदर्शनविमर्शः*. This study written in Sanskrit on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* of Kaṇāda embodies in it both the textual and the philosophical discussions.

Journal of the University of Bombay, vol. X, pt. 1

JADUNATH SARKAR.—*Sources of Maratha History*.

G. M. MORAES.—*Kanhoji Angria's Relations with the Portuguese*.

S. N. CHAKRĀVARTI.—*The Prehistoric Periods in India*.

Man in India, vol. XXI, nos. 2 & 3 (April-September, 1941)

- MANINDRA BIHUSAN BHADURI.—*The Aboriginal Tribes of the Udaypur State.*
T. R. PADMANABHACHARI.—*Games, Sports, and Pastimes in Prehistoric Relics.*

New Indian Antiquary, vol. IV, no. 5 (August, 1941)

- K. V. RANGASWAMI AYYANGAR.—*Nandipurāṇa*. The *Nandipurāṇa* extensively quoted by Lakṣmīdhara in his *Kṛtyakalpataṇi* seems to have been regarded in his time in the early 12th century as a high authority. Even then the mss. of the work, which are now perhaps extinct, had already become rare.

Ibid., vol. IV, no. 9 (December, 1941)

- T. G. ARAVAMUTHAN.—*Some Survivals of the Harappa Culture*. To be continued.

New Review, vol. XIV, April, 1941

- BETTY HEIMAN.—*Indian Concepts of the Eternal*.

Ibid., vol. XIV, September, 1941

- H. HIRAS.—*The Hamitic Indo-Mediterranean Race*. The Hamitic races now called the Indo-Mediterraneans originated from the Dravidians and created a civilisation of high order.

Poona Orientalist, vol. VI, nos. 1 & 2 (April and July, 1941)

- RAJA RAO.—*The Eclipse-code of the R̥gvedic Aryans as Revealed in the Śunaśēpa Hymns and the Brāhmanas.*
N. V. AHALYE.—*Ahalyā-Kāmadhenu of Keśavadāsa*. The note describes the ms. of a voluminous Dharmaśāstra digest called *Ahalyākāmadhenu* compiled by Keśavadāsa in the 18th century under the patronage of Ahalyābāi Holkar of Indore.
RAM KESHAV RANADE.—*Indian Charity*. Sanskrit texts in praise of charity and its various forms as found in the Veda, Purāṇa and Dharmaśāstra have been referred to in the note.
LUDWICK STERNBACH.—*Similar Social and Legal Institutions in Ancient India and in Ancient Mexico.*

- E. P. RADHAKRISHNAN.—*The Pañcapādikā Literature*. The Pañcapādikā-prasthāna or Vivaraṇaprasthāna is one of the three schools of thought that have interpreted Śaṅkarācārya's *Bhāṣya* on the *Brahmasūtra* in three different lines. The available literature on this particular Prasthāna has been dealt with in this paper.
- K. MADHAVA KRISHNA SARMA.—*Kātyāyana*. Some of the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana have been examined in this paper to determine the relation between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana. Kātyāyana's object in writing the Vārtikas was not to find fault with the grammar of Pāṇini. He tried sincerely to clear the ambiguities in the rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* by supplementing them where necessary.
- P. K. GODE.—*Date of Dhaneśvara's commentary on Bāṇa's Candīśataka—A.D. 1309 (Śaka 1231) and Aufrecht's mistaken identity of this author with his namesake, the author of a commentary on the Anargharāghava*.

Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society,

vol. XXI, nos. 3 & 4 (January-April, 1941)

- R. N. SALETORE.—*Haryab Ibn Baṭṭūta and Harihara Nṛpāla*. According to the writer of this article Haryab mentioned by the Tangerian traveller Ibn Baṭṭūta cannot be identified with Harihara Nṛpāla of the Gersoppe family.
- V. RAGHAVENDRA RAO.—*Haidar Āli and the First Mahratta War 1779-01782 A.D.*
- ANANT P. KARMAKAR.—*Administrative Machinery in Medieval Kaṇṇāṭaka (Third to Seventeenth century A.D.)*.

Science and Culture, July, 1941

- S. P. ROYCHOWDHURI.—*A Short Account of the Agricultural Methods practised in Ancient India*. The account is based on the evidence supplied by the prehistoric archaeological finds and references found in the Vedas, Purāṇas and Smṛtis.

Bibliographical Notes

- Travancore Tribes and Castes—The Aborigines of Travancore*, vol. III by L. Ananta Krishna Iyer. Travancore 1941.
- Annual Report of Archaeological Survey of India, 1936-7* edited by K. N. Dikshit. Calcutta 1940.
- Excavations at Rairb during Samvat years 1995 & 1996 (1934-37 & 1939-40 A.D.)* by K. N. Puri. Department of Archaeology & Historical Research, Jaipur State. 1941.
- Report on the Workings of the State Museum, Paddukotai for Fasl 1349.* Paddukotai 1941.
- South Indian Inscriptions*, vol. XI, pt. 1. (*Bombay-Kannatak Inscriptions*, vol. I, pt. 1). Archaeological Survey of India. Madras 1940.
- Subject Index to the Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy from 1887 to 1936.* Epigraphical Survey. Madras 1940.
- Holy Places of India* by Bimala Churn Law. Calcutta Geographical Society Publication. 1940.
- The Primitives* [on the art of Primitive man] by O. C. Gangoly. Calcutta 1941.
- Lecture on the Image of the Buddha Jinarāja (Phra Buddha Chinarat)* by Luang Boribol Burichand. Bangkok 1940.
- Buddha and Bodhisattva in Indian Sculpture*, pt. III. (Tables) by Raghu Vir and Yamamoto. Lahore 1941.
- A Quinquennium of Literary Activity of the Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Assam, 1936-1941.* Gauhati 1941.
- The Rāmāyaṇa Polity* by P. C. Dharma (Miss). Madras 1941.
- Hindu Social Institutions* by P. Walavalkar. Bombay 1941.
- Mother-right in India* by Omar Rolf Ehrenfels. Osmania University Series. Oxford University Press. 1941.
- Historical Method in Relation to Problems of South Indian History* by K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. University of Madras. 1941.
- Humāyūn Bādshāh* (vol. II.) by S. K. Banerji. Lucknow 1941.
- Adina Beg Khan—the Last Mughal Viceroy of the Panjab* by Hari Ram Gupta. Lahore 1941.
- Ancient India* by Tribhuvan L. Sah (vol. IV). Baroda 1941.

India as Described in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism by Bimala Churn Law. London 1941.

History of the Guptas by R. N. Dandekar. Poona Oriental Series. 1941.

Ancient Sind by C. L. Mariwalla. Karachi 1941.

Bussy in the Deccan by A. Martineau—Translated into English by A. Cammiade (Miss). Pondicherry 1941.

Kathāvatthu Commentary translated into English by Bimala Churn Law. Pali Text Society's Translation Series. London 1940.

Saddhamma-pajjotikā (Commentary on the Mahāniddeśa), vol. III. edited by A. P. Buddhadatta. Pali Text Society. London 1940.

Saddhamma-ppakāśinī (Commentary on Paṭisambhidāmagga), vol. II. edited by C. V. Joshi. P. T. Society. London 1940.

Gilgit Manuscripts (बौद्धग्रन्थसंग्रहः) vol. II. edited by Nalinaksha Dutt. Srinagar 1941.

पञ्चमचरित्र of Vimalasūri (३३१-३५१ सर्गः) edited by R. D. Laddu and N. A. Gore. Poona 1941.

तत्त्वार्थसूत्रजैनागमसमन्वय by Atmarani. Ludhiana 1941.

तिलोयपरणत्ती of Yativṛṣabha (Part I) edited by A. N. Upadhye. Arrah 1941.

व्यवहारशिरोमणिः of Nārāyaṇa edited by T. R. Chintamani. University of Madras. 1941.

शारीरकमोमांसाभाष्यवार्तिकम् (Part I) edited by Ananta Krishna Sastri and Asokanath Bhattacharya. Asutosh Sanskrit Series. University of Calcutta. 1941.

विज्ञानदीपिका of Padmapādācārya edited by Umesh Misra with Sanskrit Commentary. Allahabad University Sanskrit Series. 1941.

Paramārthasāra of Ādiśeṣa with English Translation by S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri. Bombay 1941.

न्यायमञ्जरी of Jayanta Bhatta (Part II) edited by Panchanan Tarkavagis. University of Calcutta. 1941.

Dvaita Philosophy and its Place in the Vedānta by H. N. Raghavendrachar. 1941.

Vīraśaiva Wellanscanung by Kumaraswami. Dharwar 1941.

Erotic Principle and unalloyed Devotion by Nisi Kanta Sanyal. Gaudiya Math. Calcutta 1941.

Din-i-Ilahi (Religion of Akbar) by Makhanlal Roychaudhury. University of Calcutta 1941.

Srī Kṛṣṇa—His Life and Teachings by M. R. Sampatkumaran. Madras 1941.

Srī Madhvaācārya and his Message to the World (Māyāvādakhaṇḍana with English Translation) by M. R. Gopalacharya. Bombay 1941.

Sikh Ceremonies by Jogendra Singh. Bombay 1941.

सर्वोल्लासतन्त्रम् of Sarvānandanātha edited by Rashmohan Chakravarti. Comilla 1941.

श्रीवियानित्याह्निकम् on daily duties of adherents of Śrīvidyā. Madras 1941.

रामकीर्तिः (*Rāmakien*—the Thai Version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* translated into Sanskrit) by Satyananda Puri and Charoen Sarahiran. Birla Oriental Series. Bangkok 1940.

महाभारतम् (आरण्यकपर्व) published from the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Poona 1941.

Introduction to Indian Textual Criticism by S. M. Katre. Karnatak Publishing House. Bombay 1941.

Assamese, Its Formation and Development by Bani Kanta Katki. Narayani Handiqui Historical Institute. Gauhati 1941.

Introduction to Ardhamaṅgadī by A. M. Ghatage. Kolhapur 1941.

वैयाकरणसिद्धान्तकौमुदी—बालमनोरमा-तत्त्वबोधिनीसमलङ्कृता (Latter Half in 2 parts) edited by Giridhar Sarma and Parameswarananda Sarma. Motilal Banarsī Dass. Lahore 1941.

प्रक्रियासर्वस्वम् (तद्धितप्रकरणम्) of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa edited by C. Kunhan Raja. University of Madras. 1941.

ग्रहगणिताध्यायः भास्कराचार्यकृतः (उत्तरार्धः) वासनाभाष्येण शिरोमणिप्रकाशटीकया च संगतः edited by D. V. Apte. Poona 1941.

षट्पञ्चाशिका edited and translated into English furnished with an English rendering of Bhaṭṭotpala's commentary thereon by V. Subrahmanya Sastri. Bangalore 1941.

श्रीमत्पाराजविजयकाव्यम् by L. Muthiah Bhagavata. Trivandrum 1941.

रसरत्नसमुच्चयः—वाग्भटकृतः सरलार्थप्रकाशिका नाम टीकयोपेतः edited by P. G. Ranade. Poona 1941.

Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Government Manuscripts Library (deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute), vols. XIII [Kāvya] and XIV [Nāṭaka] compiled by P. K. Gode. Poona 1940.

Vratakālaviveka of Śūlapāṇi

Śūlapāṇi, a *smṛti* writer of the Bengal school, once exercised a considerable influence over Bengal. A large number of manuscripts of his works is found at several places in Bengal. As Kālidāsa eclipsed his predecessors in the domain of poetry, so Raghunandana Bhaṭṭācārya—the Smārta as he is popularly designated—threw into shade the earlier writers in the field of Bengal Smṛti. The investigations of Mr. Manomohan Chakravarti have thrown some light on Śūlapāṇi. From his paper (*JRASB*, vol. XI, 1915), we learn that besides being the author of the *Dīpakalikā*, the well-known commentary on the *Jāṇnavalkyasmṛti*, he was the author of about twelve works on the rites and customs of the Hindus. The titles of his books end with the word “viveka,” just as Raghunandana’s works end with “tattva.” This has led some scholars to suppose that the minor works of Śūlapāṇi formed parts of a whole work entitled “Smṛtīviveka”—an inference which is not supported by any reliable evidence.

Of the personal history of Śūlapāṇi we know as little as of his works. In the colophons to his works he is often styled as Sāhuḍiyān (or, Sāhaḍiyān) and Mahāmahopādhyāya. Sāhuḍiyān was a section of the Rāḍhiya Brāhmaṇas of Bengal. This, along with the fact that Rudradhara refers to him as a Gaudīya, goes to show that Śūlapāṇi was a Bengali Brāhmaṇa.

It is difficult to determine the exact date of Śūlapāṇi. His date is usually placed between 1150 and 1450 A.D.

The *Vratakālaviveka*, as the very name suggests, deals chiefly with the time for the observance of Vratas (fasts). The book can be clearly divided into two distinct parts. The first part deals with Vratas in general while the second with certain particular Vratas. After the usual salutation the author describes the nature of the Vratas. Then follows a lengthy quotation on the time of commencing and concluding (*pratiṣṭhā*) the Vratas. The author then introduces a discussion on the conduct and procedure of Vratas. After this he dwells upon the consequences of not observing a Vrata once taken, and also upon bars to the observation of Vratas. Next he lays down the rules for those who have taken a vow but are unable to observe it due to physical disabilities. He then cites several authorities condemning some practices on the day of observing a vow. This is fol-

lowed by an elaborate discussion on the proper time for observing and concluding (pāraṇa) vows—the really important part of the work inasmuch as the author puts forth his own views here much more than anywhere else in the book.

The second part gives rules for the following Vratas the rules being mainly concerned with the time of observing them:—

- (1) दूर्वाष्टमी (2) बुधाष्टमी (3) रामनवमी (4) मनसा (5) कृष्णार्जुनाष्टमी
(6) एकादशी (7) द्वादशी (8) सावित्रीचतुर्दशी (9) अनन्त (10) शिवरात्रि
(11) कार्तिकेय.

It is interesting to note that these dozen Vratas by no means exhaust the long list of the Vratas observed by the Hindus.

The *Vratakālaviveka*, like the other minor *vivekas* of the author, is practically a running commentary on important passages of authoritative texts. Hence the bulk of the work is devoted to quotations sometimes very lengthy, from various authorities on the subject. The merit of the work lies in a skilful compilation of diverse materials scattered hither and thither and in making out a unified and systematic work out of a confused mass of details. The work has a unique interest in the sense that, of the extant nibandhas it is perhaps the first to enumerate the popular Vratas and to systematise the rules of observing them.

Indeed in the whole range of the nibandha literature, barring Jīmūta-vāhana's *Kālaviveka*, there is hardly any work which touches upon the subject so elaborately dealt with by Śūlapāṇi in his *Vratakālaviveka*. Yet the proper time for religious observances was by no means a subject to be neglected by the Hindus of bygone days. The *Kālaviveka*, however, unlike the *Vratakālaviveka*, deals with topics of general interest, such as, अधिमासनिरूपणम्, संक्रान्तिनिरूपणम्, पुराणतिथयः, ग्रहणकालनिरूपणम् etc. and has nothing to do with the appropriate time of observing vows. It is true that Rāghunandana in his *Vratatattvam* takes up the same subject as that of Śūlapāṇi. But a comparison of the *Vratatattvam* with the *Vratakālaviveka* reveals even to the most superficial observer that the former is simply modelled on the latter so far as the general procedure of the Vratas is concerned. At least the inference is irresistible that Rāghunandana also drew upon the same sources as utilised by Śūlapāṇi and could not make any appreciable improvement upon his predecessor. Hence the credit of systematising the rules of Vratas for the first time must go to Śūlapāṇi.

The *Vratakālaviveka* and the *Vratatattva*, though essentially the same,

differ from each other in the fact that while the former is concerned chiefly with the proper time of observing Vratas the latter does not pay much attention to the subject and dwells at great length on the procedure of abandoning the Vratas (Pratiṣṭhā). Another feature which sharply distinguishes these two works is that while Śūlapāṇi considers the rules of certain individual Vratas, Raghunandana contents himself by merely laying down rules for Vratas in general.

There may be some who would try to minimise the importance of Śūlapāṇi's work by arguing that it shows little or no originality of the author. Such a criticism would, however, not be very fair. A nibandhakāra as Śūlapāṇi is, his chief business is to make a compendium for the guidance of the priests as well as of the lay public and as a nibandhakāra he undoubtedly gives a very good account of himself.

The *Vratakālaviveka* may safely be regarded as a late work of the author as it mentions at least two of his own works, viz., the *Tīthiviveka* and the *Pratiṣṭhāviveka*.

A glance at the index of verses quoted in the work will show that besides the Dharmasāstras and the Purāṇas the author quotes from various Smṛti and Jyotiṣa works many of which are either unknown or only known in quotations. The paucity or obsolescence of these authorities are arguments for the antiquity of this work and indicate that it must have been written at an early period of the development of what is known as the Nibandha literature.

Text of the Vratakālaviveka

[In preparing the present text I have consulted three mss. belonging to the University of Dacca, two to the University of Calcutta and two belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. My thanks are due to the authorities of the above institutions for kindly permitting me to utilise their manuscripts.

In this edition care has been taken to select the most appropriate readings the alternative readings being pointed out in the footnotes as far as practicable. The citations from the Purāṇas and other works could not be traced and located in toto. An attempt has been made to give a very brief account of most of the unfamiliar authors and works on smṛti mentioned by Śūlapāṇi, mainly with the help of the famous *History of Dharmasāstra* (vol. I) by Prof. Kane.]

Description of Mss. and abbreviations

A—Dacca University Paper Ms. no. 4097.

Size: $12\frac{1}{2}'' \times 3\frac{1}{2}''$. Fols. 1-12. Complete. Six lines to a page excepting the last which contains only four. Neat Bengali characters. Fairly correct. Brown Indian paper slightly frayed at the ends.

Begins—ॐ गणेशाय नमः

Colophon—इति साहुडियान महामहोपाध्याय श्रीशूलपाणिविरचितो व्रतकालविवेकः

समाप्तः

Scribe—?

Date—?

B—D. U. Pap. Ms. no. 3348.

Size: $18'' \times 3''$. Fols. 1-11. Complete. Six lines to a page except the last containing eight. Bold Bengali characters. Fairly correct. Occasional marginal corrections. Brown country paper.

Begins—As in A

Colophon—Do (संपूर्णः for समाप्तः)

Scribe and date—?

[Page 1a contains a portion of another Ms. apparently dealing with अशाच]

C—D. U. Pap. Ms. no. 1578c.

Size: $17'' \times 4''$. Fols. 1-8a. Complete. Nine lines to a page on an average. Bengali characters—almost illegible. Damp-soiled.

Begins—As in A

Colophon—Do

Date and scribe—Do

D—Paper Ms. no. 114 belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Size: $16\frac{1}{4}'' \times 3''$. Fols. 1-4. Complete. Neat Bengali characters. Fairly correct. Yellow Indian paper.

Begins—Same as in A

Colophon—Same as in A [प्रतिष्ठाविवेक (?) for व्रतकालविवेक]

Post colophon statement:—

स्वाक्षरमिदं रजनीकान्तशर्मणः पुस्तकं च ।

नगाधिराजनन्दिनीसुताननर्तुसागर-

-विभावरीकरैर्मिते शकाब्दे प्रयत्नतः ।

भवाम्बुराशितारकं मुरारिपादपङ्कज-

द्वयं विचिन्त्य मानसे लिलेख पुस्तकोत्तमम् ॥

Scribe—रजनीकान्तशर्मा

Date—Śaka 1766 (= Circa A.D. 1844).

E—Paper Ms. no. 3437 belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Size: 18" × 3¼". Folio 1-9. Complete. Six lines to a page. Clumsy Bengali characters.

Begins—Ibid.

Colophon—Same as in A

Scribe—श्रीकालीचरण शर्मा

Date—The catalogue of mss. in the Govt. collection supposes the Bengali characters of the work to belong to the 18th century A.D.

F—Calcutta University Paper Ms. no. 1697.

Size: 16" × 4". Fols. 1-13. Complete. Bold Bengali characters. Six lines to a page except 1 b. which contains five lines.

Country paper. Occasional marginal corrections.

Colophon—Same as in A,

Scribe and date—?

G—Calcutta University Paper Ms. no. 255.

Size: 16½" × 4". Fols. 1-12. Extremely damaged and damp soiled. Neat Bengali characters. Seven lines to a page except 1 b. and 12 b. which contain 6 and 3 lines respectively. Rotten country paper. Occasional marginal gloss.

Colophon—Same as in A

Post-colophon—ॐ शिरौ (?) रक्षतं माम् !

श्रीठाकुरदासशर्मणा लिखितं

सन १२२५ साल शकाब्दा १७४०

(About A.D. 1818) भाद्रमासस्य

१३ त्रयोदशदिवसे

N—Nirṇayasāgara Press Ed. of the *Manusamhitā*, Bombay, 1909.

K—*History of Dharmasāstra* (vol. I) by Kane, Poona, 1930.

V—Vasis.

R—Raghunandana's *Vratatattvam*. Ed. J. Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1895.

श्रीशूलपाणिविरचितो व्रतकालविवेकः

नानामुनिमतद्वैधजातसंशयकृन्तनः ।

व्रतकालविवेकोऽयं क्रियते शूलपाणिना ॥

तत्र दीर्घकालानुपालनीयतत्तदितिकर्तव्यताकलापसहितनियतसंकल्पविषयो व्रतमिति व्रत-

५ लक्षणम् । व्रतानां संकल्पसंभवत्वमाह मनुः—

संकल्पमूलः कामो वै यज्ञाः संकल्पसंभवाः ।

व्रतानि यमधर्माश्च सर्वे संकल्पजाः स्मृताः ॥ इति ।

व्रतारम्भप्रतिष्ठावर्जनकालमाह ज्योतिषम्—

गुरोर्भृगोरस्तबाल्ये वार्धके सिंहगे गुरौ ।

10 गुर्वादित्ये दशाहे तु वक्रिजीवाष्टविंशके ॥

दिने प्राग्राश्यनायातातिचारिगुरुवत्सरे ।

प्राग्राशिगन्तुजीवस्य चातिचारे त्रिपक्षके ॥

कम्पाद्यद्भुतसप्ताहे नोचस्थे ज्ये मलिम्लुचे ।

भानुलङ्घितके मासि क्षये राहुयुते गुरौ ॥

15 पौषादिकचतुर्मासे चरणाङ्कितवर्षणे ।

एकेनाह्वा चैकदिने द्वितीयेन दिनत्रये ॥

तृतीयेन च सप्ताहे माङ्गल्यानि जिजीविषुः ।

विद्यारंभकर्णवैधौ चूडोपनयनोद्ग्रहान् ॥

तीर्थस्नानमनावृत्तं तथानादिसुरेक्षणम् ।

20 परीक्षारामयज्ञांश्च पुरश्चरणदीक्षणम् ॥

व्रतारंभप्रतिष्ठे च गृहारंभप्रवेशने ।

प्रतिष्ठारंभणे देवकूपादेर्वैर्जयन्ति च ॥

Lines 5 B drops व्रतलक्षणम्

„ 6-7 N II. 3 (D) व्रता नियतधर्माश्च 16)

„ 8 B ०व्रतिष्ठयोर्वैर्ज्य for ०व्रतिष्ठारवर्जन

„ 16 D दिनद्वये for त्रये

„ 17 D तु for च

„ 22 B हि for च

- द्वार्लिंशद्विसाश्वान्ते जीवस्य भार्गवस्य च ।
 द्वासप्ततिर्मह्यस्ते पादास्ते द्वादशक्रमात् ॥ इति ।
 अस्तात् प्राक्परयोः पक्षं गुरोर्वार्धकबालते ।
 पक्षं वृद्धो महास्ते तु भृगुर्बालो दशाहिकः ।
 5 पादास्ते तु दशाहानि वृद्धो बालो दिनत्रयम् ॥
 सिंहस्थगुरौ विशेषस्तु ज्योतिःकौमुद्याम्—
 गण्डक्या उत्तरे तीरे गिरिराजस्य दक्षिणे ।
 सिंहस्थं मकरस्थं च गुरुं यत्नेन वर्जयेत् ॥ इति ।
 अथ व्रतानुष्ठानम् । तल देवलः—
 10 अभुक्ता प्रातराहारं स्नात्वा चैव समाहितः ।
 सूर्यादिदेवताभ्यश्च निवेद्य व्रतमाचरेत् ॥
 अत्र प्रातर्व्रतमाचरेदित्यन्वयः प्रधानपदार्थान्वयस्य युक्तत्वात् । न तु प्रातरभुक्तेत्यनेन ।
 तथा वराहपुराणम्—
 प्रातः संकल्पयेद्विद्वानुपवासव्रतादिषु ।
 15 नापराह्णे न मध्याह्णे पित्र्यकालौ हि तौ स्मृतौ ॥
 ततश्चाहारमभुक्ता इति पूर्वदिने एकभक्तं कृत्वेत्यर्थः । दिवारात्रिप्राप्तभोजनद्वयस्यैकतर-
 निवृत्त्यैकतरस्यावसीयमानत्वात् । सूर्यादिदेवताभ्यो निवेद्य “सूर्यः सोमः” इति मन्त्रेण
 सान्निध्यं प्रकल्पयेत्यर्थः । संकल्पस्य पूर्वं नारायणस्मरणमस्कारौ च विहितौ । यथा
 योगियाज्ञवल्क्यः—

Lines 1-2 Bet, these lines B inserts पक्षं वृद्धो महास्ते जीवस्य भार्गवस्य (?)

„ 3 B परतोः for परयोः

„ 5 B वृद्धे बाले transposed. D वृद्धो बालो

„ 9 B व्रतानुष्ठानविधानं, drops तल

„ 10 Δ स्नात्वाचम्य for ०चैव

„ 11-12 Devala—Excepting a Devalasūrti no other, work of Devala is known to exist (K. page 121) though numerous quotations from Devala are found in different Smṛti works.

„ 13 B inserts च bet तथा and वराह०

„ 15 B adds इति to the line.

„ 16 D नारायणमस्कारो विहितः for नारायण...विहिती

„ 19 Cannot be traced in the N. S. Press and Vāṅgavāsī editions of the Yājñavalkyaśaṃhitā.

ध्यायेन्नारायणं नित्यं ज्ञानादिषु च कर्मसु ।
प्रायश्चित्त्यपि सर्वस्माद्दुष्कृतान्मुच्यते पुमान् ॥

तथा वराहपुराणम्—

सर्वमङ्गलमङ्गल्यं वरेण्यं वरदं शुभम् ।
नारायणं नमस्कृत्य सर्वकर्माणि कारयेत् ॥ इति ।

संकल्पविधानं च

गृहीत्वौडम्बरं पालं वारिपूर्णं गुणान्वितम् ।
दर्भलतयं साम्रमूलं फलपुष्पसमन्वितम् ॥
जलाशयारामकूपे संकल्पे पूर्वदिङ्मुखः ।
साधारणे चोत्तरास्य ऐशान्यां निक्षिपेत् पयः ॥

10

इति वचनादत्रोत्तराभिमुखेन कार्यम् । ताम्रपात्राद्यभावेऽपि केवलजलेनापि । तथा च
महाभारतम्—

गृहीत्वौडम्बरं पालं वारिपूर्णमुदङ्मुखः ।
उपवासं तु गृहीयाद् यद्वा वार्येव धारयेत् ॥

15 तदनन्तरम् आदित्यादिदेवतापूजनमाह पद्मपुराणम्—

आदित्यं गणानाथं च देवीं रुद्रं यथाक्रमम् ।
नारायणं विशुद्धाख्यमन्ते च कुलदेवताः ॥
केचित्तु देवतादौ यदा मोहाद् गणेशो न च पूज्यते ।
तदा पूजाफलं हन्ति विघ्नराजो गणाधिपः ॥

20 इति वचनेनादौ गणेशपूजनं वर्णयन्ति । तत्र क्रमविधायकपद्मपुराणवचनविरोधात् ।

नवग्रहपूजनमाह मत्स्यपुराणम्—

नवग्रहमर्खं कृत्वा ततः कर्म समारभेत् ।
अन्यथा फलदं पुंसं न काम्यं जायते क्वचित् ॥

Lines 1-2 For these lines D reads नारायणं नमस्कृत्य सर्वकर्माणि कारयेद् इति

„ 3 B च bet. तथा and वराह०

„ 3-5 omitted by D

„ 8 B फलपुष्पतिलान्वितं for फल...तम्

„ 16 A दुर्गा for रुद्रं

„ 17 R, D कुलदेवता for ०देवताः

„ 18 R होमात् (?) for मोहात्

गृहीतव्रताकरणे छागलेयः—

यो गृहीत्वा व्रतं मोहान्नाचरेत् काममोहितः ।

जीवन् भवति चाण्डालो मृतः श्वा चैव जायते ॥

अत्र प्रायश्चित्तमाह शाम्बपुराणम्—

5 लोभान्मोहात् प्रमादाद्वा व्रतभङ्गो भवेद् यदि ।

उपवासवत् कुर्यात् कुर्याद्वा केशमुण्डनम् ।

प्रायश्चित्तमिदं कृत्वा पुनरेव व्रती भवेत् ॥

वाशब्दः समुच्चये, तेन मुण्डनं च कुर्याद् इत्यर्थः । प्रमादात् सकृत्पतिते प्रतिप्रसवमाह देवलः—

10 सर्वभूतभयं व्याधिः प्रमादो गुरुशासनम् ।

अव्रतघ्नानि कथ्यन्ते सकृदेतानि शास्त्रतः ॥

आरम्भानन्तरमशीचं न प्रतिबन्धकम्—

व्रतयज्ञविवाहेषु श्राद्धे होमेऽर्चने जपे ।

आरब्धे सूतकं न स्यादनारब्धे तु सूतकम् ॥

15 इति विष्णुक्तेः । व्रतस्यारम्भः संकल्प एव

संकल्पो व्रतजापयोरिति

तेनैवोक्तेः । आरब्धव्रतस्य समापनं विना मरणे तत्फलप्राप्तिरपीति अङ्गिराः ।

यो यदर्थं चरेद्धर्मसमाप्य मृतो यदि ।

स तत्पुण्यफलं प्रेत्य प्राप्नोति मनुजब्रवीत् ॥

Lines 1 Nothing is known of Chāgaleya except that he is mentioned in the Mitākṣarā (Yājñavalkya III. 290, 326) and in some other works.

„ 4 R पद्मपुराणं for शाम्बपुराणं

„ 5 B, R यदा भवेत् for भवेद् यदि

„ 8 D समुच्चयार्थः for समुच्चये

„ 10 R अथ सर्पभयं for सर्वभूतभयं

„ 11 B कल्प्यन्ते for कथ्यन्ते

„ 12 D आरम्भानन्तरं for आरम्भानन्तरं, A drops न

„ 13-14 Cannot be traced in the Vaṅgavāsī Ed.

„ 17 A तेनैवोक्तेः for ०क्तेः

„ 18-19 Cannot be traced in the Vaṅgavāsī Ed. of the Aṅgīrah-saṃhitā.

„ 18 R मदर्थं for यदर्थं, न समाप्य for असमाप्य, भवेत् for यदि

„ 19 R प्राप्नुयात् for प्राप्नोति

प्रेत्य परलोके । अशक्तौ जलादिपाने दोषाभावमाह बौधायनः—

अष्टौ तान्यव्रतघ्नानि आपो मूलं फलं पयः ।

हविर्ब्राह्मणकाम्या च गुरोर्वचनमौषधम् ॥

गर्भिसयादौ विशेषमाह मत्स्यपुराणम्—

5 गर्भिणी सूतिका नक्तं कुमारी च रजस्वला ।

यदाऽशुद्धा तदान्येन कारयेत् क्रियते सदा ॥

अशुद्धा पूजादिकं कारयेत् । कायिकमुपवासादिकं सदा शुद्धया अशुद्धया वा स्वयं क्रियते ।

उपवासाशक्तो नक्तं भोजनं कुर्वीत ।

●

उपवासेष्वशक्तानां नक्तं भोजनमिष्यते

10 इति वचनात् । व्रतदिने वर्ज्यान्याह हारीतः—

पतितपाषण्डिनास्तिकसम्भाषानृताश्लोलादिकमुपवासदिने वर्जयेत् ।

तथा कूर्मपुराणम्—

बहिर्ग्रामान्यजान् सूतीं पतितां च रजस्वलाम् ।

न स्पृशेन्नाभिभाषेत नेक्षेत व्रतवासरे ॥

15 मिताक्षरायाम्—

गालाभ्यङ्गं शिरोऽभ्यङ्गं ताम्बूलमनुलेपनम् ।

उपवासे प्रदुष्येत दन्तधावनमञ्जनम् ॥

देवलः—

उपवासः प्रणश्येत दिवास्वप्नाक्षमैथुनैः ।

20 अत्यये चाम्बुपाने च नोपवासः प्रणश्यति ॥

इत्यादौ उपवासपदं व्रतमात्रोपलक्षणं नानावचनैकमूलत्वात् । अत्यये नाशे सम्भाव्यमाने
अम्बुपाने न नश्यतीत्यर्थः । गोतमः—

दया सर्वभूतेषु क्षान्तिरनसूया शौचमनायासोमङ्गलमकार्पण्यमस्पृहा चेति कुर्यात् ।

(Vaṅgavāsi Ed., Ch. VIII) अत्र तत्कथाश्रवणमाह देवीपुराणम्—

Lines 4 A शाम्बपुराणं (D पद्मपुराणं) for मत्स्यपुराणं

„ 13 F reads the line thus.....सूतां पतितानां च रजस्वलां

„ 16-17 Between these lines B inserts व्रतस्थो वर्जयेत् सर्वं यश्चान्य-
द्वस्तरागकृत्

„ 17 Before this line B reads भुजबलभीमे पुष्पालंकरणाभ्यङ्गं गन्धधूप-
नुलेपनं

„ 24 B श्रवणादि for श्रवणं

तद्ध्यानं तज्जपथैव तत्कथाश्रवणादिकम् ।

उपवासकृता ह्येते गुणाः प्रोक्ता मनीषिभिः ॥

सधवास्त्रीणां भर्तुरनुज्ञया व्रताचरणे तु न दोषः ।

कामं भर्तुरनुज्ञया व्रतोपवासनियमेज्यादीनामभ्यासः स्त्रीधर्म इति शङ्खस्मरणात् ।

5 इत्थं च—

नास्ति स्त्रीणां पृथग्यज्ञो न व्रतं नाप्युपोषणम् ।

पतिं शुश्रूषते यत्तु तेन स्वर्गे महीयते ॥

(Not found in N. S. press Ed. but in the Vaṅgavāsi Ed. of the Viṣṇusamhitā Ch. XXV)

19 इति मनुवचनं यत् तत् पत्यनुमतिं विना करणे बोध्यम् । अथ व्रतानुष्ठाने विहितकालाः ।

तत्र तत्तत्तिथिविशेषविहितपूजाप्रधानकव्रते पूर्वाह्नप्राप्ततिथिर्ग्राह्या । यथा नरसिंहपुराणम्—

दैवकृत्यं तु पूर्वाह्ने मनुष्याणां च मध्यमे ।

अपराह्णे पितृणां तु कार्याण्येतानि यत्नतः ॥ इति ।

तथा श्रुतिरपि । पूर्वाह्णे वै देवानामिति । उभयदिने पूर्वाह्णलाभे विशेषवचनं विना युग्मादि-

15 वचनाद्वयवस्था । तच्च तिथिविवेके विस्तरेण प्रपञ्चितमिति तलैवान्वेषणीयम् । रम्भाव्रतेतर-

तृतीयाव्रते तु चतुर्थीयुता तृतीया ग्राह्या । यथा ब्रह्मवैवर्तः—

रम्भाख्यां वर्जयित्वा तु तृतीयां मुनिसत्तम ।

अन्येषु सर्वकार्येषु गणयुक्ता प्रशस्यते ॥

इत्थं च रम्भाव्रते युग्मवचनाद्वयवस्थावसीयते । उपवासप्रधानकव्रते दिवायुग्मस्यैव ग्रहणम् ।

20 दिवा तदङ्गस्नानदेवतापूजादीनां कर्तव्यत्वात् । नक्कादिव्रते तु रात्रियुग्मस्यापि ग्रहणम् ।

यथा जावालाः—

Lines 1 D त्यवस्थाश्रवणं तथा for त्य...दिकं

„ 4 D drops अभ्यास

„ 6 D drops श्रीणां

„ 6-7 N. V. 155

„ 10 B कालः for कालाः

„ 14 Bet. देवानां and इति B, D insert मध्यंदिनं मनुष्याणां अपराह्ण-
पितृणां (D omits अपराह्णपितृणां)

„ 20 B inserts कर्मणां bet. पूजादीनां and कर्तव्यत्वात्
B नक्कादिब्रतयोगे for न...ते, रात्रियोगस्यापि for रा...पि, तथा for यथा

„ 21 Jāvāla—mentioned in the Mitākṣarā and some other works
but no work of this author exists.

अहःसु तिथयः पुरयाः कर्मानुष्ठानतो दिवा ।

नक्कादिब्रतयोगे तु रात्रियोगो विशिष्यते ॥

दिवा कर्मानुष्ठाने कर्तव्ये अहःसु तिथयः पुरयाः तिथ्यन्तरसंयोगात् पुरया अतः कर्मानुष्ठाने ता एव ग्राह्याः । अन्यथा अहर्विहिते कर्मणि अहर्विधानमनर्थकं स्यात् ।

- 5 नक्कादिब्रतयोगे तु रात्रियोगो रात्रौ तिथ्यन्तरसंयोगो विशिष्यते इत्यर्थः । तत्र दिवा युग्मग्रहणमपि परदिने त्रिसंध्याकालाव्यापित्वे बोध्यम् ।

त्रिसंध्याव्यापिनी या तु सैव पूज्या सदा तिथिः ।

न तत्र युग्मादरणमन्यत्र हरिवासरात् ॥

- इति पारशरोयात् । त्रिसंध्याव्यापित्वं तु उदयास्तमयकालव्यापित्वं युग्मानाग्रात-
10 तिथिषु उभयदिने पूर्वाह्णादिकालप्राप्तयप्राप्तयोः शुक्लकृष्णपक्षभेदेन व्यवस्था इत्युक्तं तिथि-
विवेके । यद्ब्रतं दिवा क्रियत् रात्रौ क्रियच्च क्रियते न तत्र दिवायुग्मस्य ग्रहणं किंतु
रात्रियुग्मस्यैव ग्रहणम्, अन्यथा रात्रौ तिथ्यलाभे तद्विहितसंशयाभावात् । यथा—
मनोरथद्वितीयायां दिवा वासुदेवार्चनम् रात्रौ चन्द्रोदये चार्घ्यदानं नक्तं भोजनादिकम् ॥
इति

- 15 यथा विष्णुधर्मोत्तरे—

देवमभ्यर्च्य पुष्पैश्च धूपदीपानवारिभिः ।

उद्गच्छतस्तु बालेन्दोर्दद्यादर्घ्यं समाहितः ॥

नक्तं भुञ्जीत च नरो यावत्तिष्ठति चन्द्रमाः ।

अस्तं गते न भुञ्जीत व्रतभङ्गभयान्नरः ॥ इति

- 20 यथा पद्मपुराणे—

दिवा रात्रौ व्रतं यच्च एकत्रैव तिथौ स्मृतम् ।

तस्यामुभयगामिन्यामाचरेच्च व्रतं व्रती ।

Lines 6 D drops संध्या B drops काला

„ 11 A यत्कृतं for यद्ब्रतं

„ 12 B inserts कर्मणि bet. तद्विहित and संशयाभावात्

„ 13 D दिवा and वासुदेवार्चनं transposed

„ 15 A work entitled विष्णुधर्मोत्तरामृत is mentioned in Jimūta-
vāhanās Kālaviveka.

„ 17 A, C उद्गतास्तु (D उद्गतस्य) for उद्यातस्तु. D दद्यात् and अर्घ्यं
transposed.

„ 21 B एवमेव for एकत्रैव. A स्थितिः for स्मृतं

„ 22 B उभययोगिन्यां for ०गामिन्यां, D आचरेत्तद् for आचरेच्च

तेन प्रतिपद्युक्तापि द्वितीया कर्मार्थं दिवा रात्रौ च लभ्यते न तदा युग्मादरः कार्यः द्वितीया-
तृतीयायुग्मदिने द्वितीयाविहितकर्मणि द्वितीयाकालस्याभावात् । आरोग्यसप्तमीव्रतस्य

षष्ठ्यां चैककृताहारः सप्तम्यामुपवासकृत् ।

अष्टम्यामेव भुञ्जीत एष एव विधिः स्मृतः ॥

5 इति वराहपुराणवचनेन षष्ठ्यादिषु विशिष्य तत्तत्कर्माभिधानेन—

न षष्ठीसमेता कर्तव्या सप्तमी नाष्टमीयुता ।

पतङ्गोपासनायेह षष्ठ्यामाहुरुपोषणम् ॥

इति भविष्यपुराणीयविषयत्वं किंतु अष्टम्यामेवेत्यनेनाष्टम्यां पारणनियमाभिधानात् पारण-
दिने पारणयोग्याष्टम्यलाभे षष्ठीयुताप्युपोष्या युग्मात्, अन्यथा नियमभङ्गापत्तेः । एतच्च

10 मासविशेषविहितत्वाभावेन मलमासेऽपि कर्तव्यम् । “अनेन वत्सरं पूर्णं विधिना योऽर्च-
येद्रवि”मित्यनेन संवत्सरकर्तव्यत्वाभिधानात् । संवत्सरश्च त्रयोदशभिर्मासैरपि भवतीति ।
यथा श्रुतिः—

द्वादश मासाः संवत्सरः क्वचित्रयोदश मासाः संवत्सर इति । विधानसप्तम्यां तु
माघादिद्वादशमासविशेषविहितत्वान्न मलमासकर्तव्यता । यथा वशिष्ठः—

15 आरब्धे तु व्रते पश्चात् संप्राप्ते त्वधिमासके ।

पूर्वमानेन तं त्यक्त्वा कार्यं द्वादशमासिकम् ॥ इति ।

एतद्व्रतं षष्ठीयुक्तसप्तम्यां कार्यम्—

षष्ठीयुता सप्तमी तु कर्तव्या तात सर्वदा ।

षष्ठी च सप्तमी यत्नं तत्तं संनिहितो हरिः ॥

20 इति वचनात् युग्माच्च । भविष्ये—

भाद्रमासि सिते पक्षे सप्तम्यां नियमेन या ।

ज्ञात्वा शिवं लेखयित्वा मण्डले च सहाम्बिकम् ।

पूजयेच्च तदा तस्यां दुष्प्रापं नैव विद्यते ॥

इति इयमेव ललितासप्तमी । तत्तं युग्मात् षष्ठीयुतसप्तम्यां व्रतं कार्यम् ।

Lines 8 A षष्ठ्यामेव for अष्टम्यामेव

„ 9 A पारणात् for पारण

„ 11 B तथा च for यथा

„ 14 A यथाह for यथा

„ 15-16 Cannot be traced in V

„ 16 A पूर्वमासे न for पूर्वमानेन

अथ ष्कृणजन्माष्टमीव्रतम्

तत्र यद्दिने जयन्तीलाभस्तद्दिने व्रतम् । यथा वशिष्ठः—

अष्टमी रोहिणीयुक्ता निश्चयं दृश्यते यदि ।

मुख्यकालः स विज्ञेयस्तत्र जातो हरिः स्वयम् ॥

५ तथा जयन्तीलङ्घनप्रत्यवायश्रुतिरपि, यथा स्कन्दपुराणम्—

न करोति यदाविष्णोर्जयन्तीसंज्ञकं व्रतम् ।

यमस्य वशमापन्नः सहते नारकीं व्यथाम् ॥ इति ।

जयन्तीयोगश्च वराहसंहितायां उक्तः) यथा

सिंहाकं रोहिणीयुक्ता नराः कृष्णाष्टमी यदि ।

10 रात्र्यर्धपूर्वापरगा जयन्ती कलयापि च ॥

मिहाकं उपलक्षणं कर्कटेऽपि । तथा च स्कन्दपुराणम्—

रोहिणीसहिता कृष्णा मासे च श्रावणेऽष्टमी ।

अर्धरात्रादधर्श्वं कलयापि यदा भवेत् ॥

अत्र कलयेति पदात् नालमुहूर्तादरः । उभयदिने जयन्तीलाभे परदिने ।

15 उदये तूपवासस्य नक्तस्यास्तमये तिथिः

इति बांधायनेनोपवासे उदयगामितिथेरभिधानात् । एवम्

उपोषितव्यं नक्षत्रं येनास्तं याति भास्करः ।

यत्र वा युज्यते राम निशीथे शशिना सह ॥

इति विष्णुधर्मोत्तरीयेण नक्षत्रस्यास्तनिशीथसम्बन्धेन बलवत्त्वात् तिथेस्त्रिमध्याव्यापि-

20 त्वाच्च । जयन्त्यलाभे रोहिणीयुता ग्राह्या । यथा वशिष्ठः—

वासरे वा निशायां वा यत्र युक्ता तु रोहिणी ।

विशेषेण नभोमासि सैवोपोष्या सदा तिथिः ॥

उभयदिने तन्नाभे परदिने । यथा ब्रह्मवैवर्तः—

सप्तमीसहिताष्टम्यां भूत्वा ऋक्षं द्विजोत्तम ।

25 प्राजापत्यं द्वितीयेऽहि मुहूर्तादं भवैवदि ।

तदाष्टयामिकं ज्ञेयं प्रोक्तं व्यासादिभिः पुरा ॥ १

Lines 3-4 Cannot be traced in V.

„ 6.11 न करोति (1.6) ..स्कन्दपुराणम् (1.11) omitted by A

„ 21-22 Cannot be traced in V.

„ 24 A कृत्वा for भूत्वा

मुहूर्तेनापि संयुक्ता सा संपूर्णाष्टमी स्मृता ।

किं पुनर्नवमीयुक्ता कुलकोट्यास्तु मुक्तिदा ॥

राहिणीयोगाभावे तु अर्द्धरात्रयुताष्टमी ग्राह्या

दिवा वा यदि वा रात्रौ नास्ति चेद्रोहिणीकला ।

5 रात्रियुक्तां प्रकुर्वीत विशेषेण्डुसंयुताम् ॥

इति वचनात् ।

उपोष्य जन्मचिह्नानि कुर्याज्जागरणं तु यः ।

अर्द्धरात्रयुताष्टम्यां सोऽश्वमेधफलं लभेत् ॥

इति नारदीयाच्च । परदिने पारणे तु मार्द्धप्रहरनिशाभ्यन्तरे तिथिनक्षत्रयोरवसाने

10 पारणम् ।

अष्टम्यामथ रोहिण्यां न कुर्यात् पारणं क्वचित् ।

हन्यात् पुराकृतं कर्म उपवासार्जितं फलम् ॥

तिथिरष्टगुणं हन्ति नक्षत्रं च चतुर्गुणम् ।

तस्मात् प्रयत्नतः कुर्यात् तिथिमान्ते च पारणम् ॥

15 इति ब्रह्मवैवर्तायात् । यदा तु महानिशायाः पूर्वमेकतरस्यावसानं महानिशायामेकतरस्य तदा एकतरावसान एव पारणम्—

तिथिनक्षत्रसंयोगे उपवासो यदा भवेत् ।

तावदेव न भोक्तव्यं यावन्नैकस्य संक्षयः ॥

इति नारदीयात् । महानिशायासुभयस्थित्यां तु प्रातरुत्पवान्ते पारणम्—

20 तिथ्यन्ते वोत्सवान्ते वा व्रतो कुर्वीत पारणम्

इति गारुडात् ।

अथ दूर्वाष्टमीव्रतम्

तत् पूर्वविद्धाष्टम्यां कार्यम्—

श्रावणी दूर्गनवमी दूर्वा चैव हुताशनी ।

25 पूर्वविद्धैव कर्तव्या शिवरात्रिर्बलेर्दिनम् ॥

Lines 1 B भवेत् for स्मृता

„ 15 Bet. एकतरस्य and तद् D inserts अवसानं महानिशायामेकस्य. D drops एव

„ 17 B at योगे and उपवासो D inserts तु, contrary to metre.

„ 19 D omits इति नारदीयात्

इति बृहस्पत्युक्तेः ।

अथ बुधाष्टमीव्रतम्

तत्तु चैवपौषहरिशयनादितरत्र काले कार्यम् । यदाह राजमार्तण्डः—

पतङ्गे मकरे याते देवे जाप्रति केशवे ।

5

बुधाष्टमीं प्रकुर्वीत वर्जयित्वा तु चैलकीम् ॥

प्रसुप्ते च जगन्नाथे संख्याकाले मधौ तथा ।

बुधाष्टमीं न कुर्वीत कृता हन्ति पुराकृतम् ॥ इति ।

एतद्रूपमारब्धमपि चैलादौ न कर्तव्यं यथा स्मृतिः—

मीने धनुषि देवेशे सुप्तेऽशुद्धदिने तथा ।

10

बुधाष्टमीं न कुर्वीत प्रारब्धमपि चैव हि ॥ इति ।

अथ श्रीरामनवमीव्रतम्

तत्रापस्तम्बः—

चैलशुक्ला तु नवमी पुनर्वसुयुता यदि ।

सैव मध्याह्नयोगे तु महापुण्यतमा भवेत् ॥

15

नवमी चाष्टमीविद्धा त्याज्या विष्णुपरायणैः ।

उपोषणं नवम्यां वै दशम्यामेव पारणम् ॥

अत्र दशम्यामेवेत्यनेन दशम्यां पारणनियमादेकादश्यां दशम्यनिर्गमे पुनर्वसुयोगाभावेऽपि सर्वेरेवाष्टमीविद्धोपोष्येति ।

अथ मनसाव्रतम्

20

मनसाव्रतं तु ज्यैष्ठशुक्लनवम्यां हस्तानक्षत्रयुतायां कार्यम् । यथा

Lines 3 The Rājāmārtanda appears to be a work of Bhoja on astrology in relation to Dharmaśāstra and contains such topics as व्रतबन्धकाल, विवाहशुभकाल, etc.

„ 4 R माधवे for केशवे

„ 5-6 Omitted by D.

„ 19 B omits this line

„ 20 Before this line B adds the following एतद्व्रतं नित्यम् ।

प्राप्ते श्रीरामनवमीदिने मर्त्यो विमूढधीः ।

उपोषणं न कुरुते कुम्भीपाके च पच्यते ॥ इति निन्दाश्रवणात् ।

Bet युतायां and कार्यं B inserts मनसादेवीव्रतं प्रतिवर्षं, bet. कार्यं and यथा—हस्तायोगाभावे केवलदशम्यामपि

कृत्यकामधेनुवृत्तो व्यासः—

ज्यैष्ठे शुक्लदशम्यां तु हस्तं चैव ब्रह्मरूपिणी ।

कश्यपान्मनसा देवी जातेति मनसा स्मृता ॥

तस्मात्तां पूजयेत्तत्त वर्षे वर्षे विधानतः ।

5

अनन्ताद्यष्टनागांश्च नरो नियमतत्परः ॥ इति ।

अत्र विधौ हस्तयोगश्रवणात् हस्तनक्षत्रयुतदशम्यां पूजयेदित्येको विधिः, केवलदशम्या-
मपीत्यपरश्च, अन्यथा प्रतिवर्षकर्तव्यत्वानुपपत्तेः एवं

वर्षे वर्षे तु यः कुर्यान्मनसाव्रतमुत्तमम् ।

तं रक्षेत् सततं देवी विषसर्पभयात्स्वयम् ॥

10

इति तद्धृतवचनान्तरफलमपि बोध्यम् । ततश्चोभयदिने हस्तयुतदशमीलाभे, केवल-
दशमीलाभे परदिने, शुक्लपक्ष इत्यादिवचनात् ।

अथ एकादशीव्रतम्

तत्र अष्टाब्दादधिकापूर्णाशीतिवत्सरवयस्कनरमातस्याधिकारः । यथा स्मृतिः—

अष्टाब्दादधिको मर्त्यो ह्यपूर्णाशीतिवत्सरः ।

15

भुङ्क्ते यो मानवो मोहादेकादश्यां स पापकृत् ॥

एतद्व्रतं नित्यम् । यथा भविष्यपुराणम्—

नित्यमेतद्व्रतं नाम कर्तव्यं सार्ववर्षिकम् ।

सर्वाश्रमाणां सामान्यं सर्वधर्मेष्वनुत्तमम् ।

एकादश्यां न भुञ्जीत पक्षयोरुभयोरपि ॥

20 तथा ब्रह्मवैवर्तः—

इति विज्ञाय कुर्वीतावश्यमेकादशीव्रतम् ।

विशेषनियमाशक्तोऽहोरात्रं भुक्तिवर्जितः ॥

अत्र कृष्णायां पुत्रवदगृहस्थस्योपवासनिषेधमाह ब्रह्मपुराणम्—

Lines 1 Kāmadhenu—Probably this is the same Kāmadhenu which
is cited by Śūlapāṇi in his Śrāddheviveka and
ascribed by modern scholars to one Gopāla.
No Ms. of this work has been found.

,, 4 F reads this line thus—.....तत्र द्रव्यैर्नानाविधैरपि

,, 10 तवचनान्तरे फलश्रुतेः काम्यत्वं च for B तद्धृत...बोध्यं

आदित्येऽहनि संक्रान्त्यामसितैकादशीदिने ।

व्यतीपाते कृते श्राद्धे पुत्री नोपवसेद्गृही ॥

अत्र वैष्णवस्य विशेषमाह स्मृतिः—

यथा शुक्ला तथा कृष्णा यथा कृष्णा तथेतरा ।

5

तुल्ये ते मन्यते यस्तु स वै वैष्णव उच्यते ॥

अवैष्णवस्य पुलवद्गृहस्थस्य शयनबोधनमध्ये प्रतिप्रसवमाह ब्रह्मवैवर्तः—

शयनीबोधनीमध्ये या कृष्णैकादशी भवेत् ।

सैवोपोष्या गृहस्थेन नान्या कृष्णा कदाचन ।

एतच्च द्विजातीतरपरम्—

10

उभयोः पक्षयो राजन्नेकादश्यां द्विजात्मवान् ।

यो भुङ्क्ते नोरुजः सोऽपि प्रेत्य चाण्डालतां व्रजेत् ॥

इति भविष्यपुराणात् । प्रचेताः—

पूर्णाप्येकादशी ल्याज्या वर्द्धते द्वितयं यदि ।

द्वादश्यां पारणालाभे पूर्णैव परिगृह्यते ॥

15

द्वितयमेकादशी द्वादशी च । अत्र पूर्णलक्षणमाह सौरधर्मः—

आदित्योदयवेलायाः प्राङ्मुहूर्तद्वयान्विता ।

सैकादशीति संपूर्णा विद्वान्या परिकीर्तिता ॥

अत्र परदिने द्वादश्यनिर्गमे विशेषमाह गरुडपुराणम्—

पुनः प्रभातसमये घटिकैका यदा भवेत् ।

20

ततोपवासो विहितो वनस्थस्य यत्तेस्तथा ।

विधवायाश्च तलैव परतो द्वादशी न चेत् ॥

यत् तु पूर्वदिने सूर्योदयानन्तरं दशमीविष्टैकादशी, परिदिने द्वादशीमिश्रा तत् परा सर्वेरेवोपोष्या इत्याह स्मृतिः—

एकादशी द्वादशीमिश्रा परतोऽपि न वर्द्धते ।

25

गृहिभिर्यतिभिश्चैव सैवोपोष्या सदा तिथिः ॥

अपि भिन्नक्रमेण तेन द्वादशी न वर्द्धतेऽपि । यदा तु तथाविधा सती परदिने न निःसरति तदा द्वादश्यामुपवासमाह कूर्मपुराणम्—

एकादशीमुपवसेद् द्वादश्यामथवा पुनः

विमिश्रास्त्रपि कुर्वीत न दशम्या युतां क्वचित् ॥

कुर्यादलामे संयुक्तां नालामेऽपि प्रवेशिनीम् ।
उपोष्य द्वादशीं तत्र तयोदश्यां तु पारणम् ॥
उदयात् प्राग् दशम्यास्तु शेषः संयोग उच्यते ।
उपरिष्ठात् प्रवेशस्तु तस्मात्तां परिवर्जयेत् ॥

- 5 अलामे परदिने एकादश्यनिर्गमे संयुक्ताम् अरुणोदयविद्धां कुर्याद् इत्यर्थः । तेन द्वादशीदिने एकादश्यनिर्गमे सैवोपोष्येति गम्यते । तत्रापि तयोदश्यां द्वादशीलाभ एव परोपोष्येत्यवधेयम् ।

मुहूर्तं द्वादशी न स्यात् तयोदश्यां यदा मुने ।
उपोष्या दशमीविद्धा सर्वैरेकादशी तदा ॥

- 10 इति कूर्मपुराणायनेन तयोदश्यां द्वादश्यलाभेऽरुणोदयविद्धायाः कर्तव्यत्वोपदेशाच्च । अत्रारुणोदयविद्धायामुपोष्य परदिने द्वादश्यायपादमुत्तीर्य पारणं कुर्यात् । यदाह विष्णुधर्मोत्तरम्—

द्वादश्याः प्रथमः पादो हरिवासरसंज्ञकः ।
तमतिक्रम्य कुर्वीत पारणं विष्णुतत्परः ॥ इति ।

- 15 परदिने द्वादश्यलाभेऽपि तद्विधैकादशी वैष्णवैर्नोपोष्या इत्याह गरुडपुराणम्
दशमीशेषसंयुक्ता यदि स्यादरुणोदयः ।
नैवोपोष्यं वैष्णवेन तद्दिनैकादशीव्रतम् ॥

तत्र तु विशेषमाह भविष्यपुराणम्—

एकादशीं दशाविद्धां वर्द्धमाने विवर्जयेत् ।

- 20 पक्षे हानौ स्थिते सोमे लङ्घयेद्दशमीयुताम् ॥ इति ।

एतद्विरुद्धानि नानाविधवचनानि बहूनि व्यवहारापरिगृहीततयाऽनुपादेयानीति मन्तव्यम् ।

अथ द्वादशीव्रतम्

अत्र पिपीतकीद्वादशीव्रते

- 25 एकादश्यां प्रकुर्वन्ति उपवासं मनीषिणः ।
उपासनाय द्वादश्यां विष्णोर्यद्विद्यं तथा ॥ इति

Lines 6 Bet द्वादशीदिने and एकादशी° A inserts एकादशीदिने

„ 20 B सूर्ये for सोमे

भविष्यपुराणीयेन उपवासानन्तरं द्वादश्यां विष्णुपासनाया उक्तत्वेन नात्र युग्मादरः ।
यदा त्वेकादशीदिने द्वादशीक्षयस्तदानन्तर्यं विनापि पूजा कर्तव्येति । बृहन्नारदीयोक्त-
मार्गशीर्षादिद्वादशमासीयद्वादशीव्रतस्य

मार्गशीर्षे शुभे मासि द्वादश्यां ससुपोषितः

- 5 इत्यादिवचनेन एकादश्युपवासानन्तरं कर्तव्यत्वाभिधानेन नात्र युग्मादरः । एवं
मासविशेषविहितत्वेन न मलमासकर्तव्यता । द्वादश्युपवासप्रधानकभारतोक्तमार्गशीर्षादि-
द्वादशमाससाध्यवैष्णवव्रते तु दिवायुग्मस्यैव ग्रहणं पूर्वोक्तयुक्तेः । अत्राप्युक्तयुक्तेन
मलमासे कर्तव्यत्वम् ।

सावित्रीचतुर्दशीव्रतम्

- 10 तु पूर्वविद्धायां चतुर्दश्यां कर्तव्यम् । यथा निगमः—

कृष्णपक्षेऽष्टमी चैव कृष्णपक्षे चतुर्दशी ।

पूर्वविद्धैव कर्तव्या परविद्धा न कुत्रचित् ॥

नारदोऽपि—

दिवाभागे त्रयोदश्यां यदा चतुर्दशी भवेत् ।

- 15 तत्र पूज्या महासाध्वी देवी सत्यवता सह ॥

दिवाभाग इति दिवा मुहूर्तकालमात्रे चतुर्दशीलाभेऽपि, त्रयोदश्यां दिवातनमुद्धर्ते चतुर्दश्य-
लाभे, परदिने त्रिसंध्याकालव्यापित्वे परदिने एव त्रिसंध्याव्यापिनीति वचनात् । यदा
पूर्वापरदिने न तथाविधा तदा परदिने एव । तथाच ज्योतिषम्—

चतुर्दश्याममावस्या यदा भवति नारद ।

- 20 उपोष्या पूजनोया सा चतुर्दश्यां विधानतः ॥ इति ।

सा सावित्री । इत्थं च

शिवाऽधोरा तथा प्रेता सावित्री च चतुर्दशी ।

कुट्टयुक्तैव कर्तव्या कुहामेव हि पारणम् ॥

इति वचनमप्येतद्विषयमिति । महासावित्रीव्रतं तु भविष्योत्तरोक्तं यथा

- 25 पञ्चदश्यां तथा ज्यैष्ठ्ये वटमूले महासतीम् ।

त्रिरात्रोपोषिता नारी विधिनानेन पूजयेत् ॥

Lines 3 F inserts द्वादश bet. ०मासीय and द्वादशी

„ 6 B drops न

„ 7 D drops न

„ 14 A मुने for भवेत्

- अशक्ता तु त्रयोदश्यां नक्तं कुर्याज्जितेन्द्रिया ।
 अयाचितं चतुर्दश्यामवास्थासुपोषणम् ॥
 सार्धं सत्यवता साध्वी फलनैवेद्यदोपकैः ।
 वटावलम्बनं काष्ठभारं (?) युधिष्ठिर ॥
 5 विकटैः सप्तधानैश्च बहुधर्मप्रकल्पितैः ।
 रजन्या कण्ठसूत्रैश्च शुभैः कुङ्कुमकेशरैः ॥
 रात्रौ जागरणं कुर्यान्मृत्युगीतपुरःसरम् ।
 ततो वंशमये पाले वस्त्रयुग्मेन वेष्टिते ॥
 साविलीप्रतिमां कृत्वा सर्वावयवशोभिनीम् ।
 10 सौवर्णां मृन्मयीं वापि स्वशक्त्या रुक्मनिर्मिताम् ॥
 ततः प्रभाते विमले पूर्वोक्तेन नरोत्तम ।
 तामपि ब्राह्मणे दत्त्वा प्रणिपत्य समापयेत् ॥
 तां शूर्पस्थां साविलीप्रतिमां । मन्त्रस्तु
 साविलीयं मया दत्ता सहिरण्या महासती ।
 15 ब्राह्मणप्रीणानार्थाय ब्राह्मण परिगृह्यताम् ॥
 एवं दद्याद्विजेन्द्राय सावित्रीं तां युधिष्ठिर ।
 ततो भुक्त्वा हविष्यान्नं ब्राह्मणैर्बान्धवैः सह ।
 विसर्जयेत्ततो विप्रं साविलि प्रीयतामिति ॥
 या त्वेवं क्रियते नारी साविलीव्रतमुत्तमम् ।
 20 अवैधव्यं भवेत्तस्याः सावित्रीतुल्यसन्ततिः ॥ इति
 अलेतिकर्तव्यताबाहुल्यात् महासाविलीव्रतमिदमतो न पूर्वोक्तेन विरोधः ।

अथ अनन्तव्रतम्

- भाद्रशुक्लचतुर्दश्यां कर्तव्यम् । यथा भविष्यपुराणम्—
 तथा शुक्लचतुर्दश्यां मासि भाद्रपदे भवेत् ।
 25 तस्यानुष्ठानमालेख सर्वं पापं प्रणश्यति ॥
 तस्य पूर्वोक्तानन्तव्रतस्य । अतोभयदिने पूर्वाह्णे चतुर्दशीलाभे परदिने व्रतं युग्मात् ।

Lines 6 F' काष्ठसूत्रैश्च(?) for कण्ठसूत्रैश्च

,, 23 A भाद्रचतुर्दश्यां [B मासि भाद्र शुक्लचतुर्दश्यां] for भाद्र...स्यां

अथ शिवरात्रिव्रतम्

तल नागरखण्डम् —

माघमासस्य शेषे या प्रथमे फाल्गुनस्य च ।

कृष्णा चतुर्दशी सा तु शिवरात्रिः प्रकीर्तिता ॥

5 तत्र तु प्रधानमुपवासः ।

न स्नानेन न वस्त्रेण न धूपेन न चार्चया ।

तुष्यामि न तथा पुष्पैर्यथा तत्तोपवासतः ॥

इति शिववचनात् । एतद्व्रतं नित्यम् ।

वर्षे वर्षे महादेवि नरो नारी पतिव्रता ।

10 शिवरात्रौ महादेवं कामं भक्त्या प्रपूजयेत् ॥

इति पद्मपुराणे वीप्साश्रुतेः । स्मृतिः—

प्रदोषव्यापिनी ग्राह्या शिवरात्रिश्चतुर्दशी ।

निशीथव्यापिनी चाल ततोऽधिकफला मता ॥

अत्राधिकफलेति श्रुतेः

15 माघे कृष्णचतुर्दश्यामादिदेवो महानिशि ।

शिवलिङ्गतयोद्भूतः कोटिसूर्यसमप्रभः ।

तत्कालव्यापिनी ग्राह्या शिवरात्रिव्रते तिथिः ॥

इति ईशानसंहितावचनाच्च । निशीथव्यापिन्यां चतुर्दश्यां व्रतं, निशीथश्च रात्रिमध्य-
दण्डद्वयात्मकः कालः, तथा च ईशानसंहितायाम्

20 अर्धरात्रादधश्चोर्ध्वं यत् युक्ता चतुर्दशी ।

व्याप्ता सा दृश्यते यस्यां तस्यां कुर्याद् व्रतं नरः ॥ इति ।

ततश्च यदिने प्रदोषनिशीथोभयव्यापिनी चतुर्दशी तद्दिने व्रतम्, उभयव्याप्यनुरोधात् ।

यदा तु पूर्वदिने निशीथव्याप्तिस्तदा पूर्वदिने व्रतं, प्रधानकालव्याप्यनुरोधात् । यदा तु

पूर्वदिने न निशीथव्यापिनी परदिने तु प्रदोषव्यापिनी तदा परदिने व्रतं, प्रदोषव्यापिनोति

25 वचनात् । तिथेस्त्रिसंध्याव्यापित्वाच्च । अत्रामावास्यायां पारणम्

Lines 18 An Isānasaṃhitā—a name very rarely met with is men-
tioned in समयमयूख

„ 18-21 D omits these lines.

„ 22 D drops चतुर्दशी

„ 23 B प्राप्ति for व्याप्ति

„ 23 Before this line B adds परदिने प्रदोषव्याप्तिः

शिवाऽधोरा तथा प्रेता सावित्री च चतुर्दशी ।

कुहुयुक्त्वा कर्तव्या कुहामेव हि पारणम् ॥

इति वचनात् । यत्तु

तिथीनामेव सर्वासामुपवासव्रतादिषु ।

5 तिथ्यन्ते पारणं कुर्याद् विना शिवचतुर्दशीम् ॥

इति वचनं तत् चतुर्दश्यां पारणसंभवे बोध्यम् ।

ब्रह्माण्डोदरमध्ये तु यानि तीर्थानि सन्ति वै ।

पूजितानि भवन्तीह भूताहं पारणे कृते ॥

इति स्कन्दपुराणे चतुर्दशीपारणे फलार्थवादश्रवणात् । यत्तु

10 त्रयोदश्यां यदा रात्रौ याममेकं चतुर्दशी ।

उपोष्या सा महापुराया शम्भोर्वचनमब्रवीत् ॥

इति शिवपुराणवचनात् त्रयोदश्यां याममाले चतुर्दशीलामेऽपि तद्दिने व्रतमिति मतं तन्नादरणीयं, पूर्वोक्तस्मृतीशानसंहितावचनविरोधात् । एतद्वचनस्य कामधेन्वादिभिर-
लिखितत्वेनानाकरत्वाच्च । एवं च

15 महतामाप पापानां दृष्टा च निष्कृतिः पुरा ।

न दृष्टा निष्कृतिः पुंसां शिवरात्रिं कुह्युताम् ॥

इति वचनं यत्तदनाकरमेव, भवतु वा साकरं तदा, त्रयोदशीयुक्तचतुर्दश्यामुपवाससंभवे वेदितव्यम् । अमावस्यादिव्रतमारब्धं चेत् मलमासेऽपि कार्यं मासविशेषविहितत्वाभावात् ।

मासे मलिम्लुचेऽप्येवं यजेद्देवीं सशङ्कराम् ।

20 किं तु नोद्यापनं कार्यमित्याह भगवान् शिवः ॥

इति विष्णुरहस्योयेन मासविशेषानङ्कितमासमालविहितस्य कर्तव्यत्वाभिधानात् ।

संक्रान्तिनिमित्तकं व्रतं तत्तत्संक्रान्तिपुराणकाल एव कार्यम्—

लुटेः सहस्रभागो यः स कालो रविसंक्रमः

इत्युक्तसंक्रान्तिकालस्यानिसूक्ष्मत्वेन कर्मानर्हतया संक्रान्तिपदस्य लक्षणाया तत्परत्वात् ।

25 अत्र तु

Lines 15 B, F कुर्वतां for निष्कृतिः

,, 23 B संक्रान्तिः परिकीर्तिता for स... .क्रमः

,, 24 Bet. तत् and परत्वात् D inserts पुराणकाल Bet. परत्वात् and अत्र B inserts the following :

तुटिस्तु लक्ष्मणचतुर्भागस्तुटिरित्यभिधीयते ।

तुटिद्वयं नवप्रोक्तो निमेषस्तु नवद्वयम् ॥ इति स्मृत्युक्ता ।

वृश्चिकस्य तु संक्रान्त्यां पुनःकामा व्रतं चरेत्

इति भविष्यपुराणीयेन कार्तिकेयव्रतस्य संक्रान्तिविहितत्वेऽपि

सायंकाले समारोप्य प्रातःकाले विसर्जयेत्

इति भविष्यपुराणीयेन पूजाया रात्रिमात्रकर्तव्यत्वाभिधानात् । तदङ्गोपवासस्य चाहोरात्र-

- 5 साध्यतया तत्पुण्यकाले तदसम्भवात् तद्युक्ताहोरात्र एव कर्तव्यत्वम् । ततश्च संपूर्णाहो-
रात्रात् परं वृश्चिकसंक्रान्तौ परदिने पूर्वयामद्वयस्य पुण्यकालत्वेन तद्युक्ताहोरात्र एव
कार्तिकेयव्रतं कर्तव्यं दिवा तदङ्गस्नानादेः कर्तव्यत्वात्, व्रतत्वेन प्रातरारम्भाहर्त्वात्
तदङ्गोपवासस्य प्रातरारम्भाहर्त्वाच्च । उक्तान्यव्रतेषु युग्मवचनशुक्लपक्षकृष्णपक्षादिभेदेन
तिथिविवेकोक्तरीत्या व्यवस्थाऽनुसरणीयेति । ~~व्रत~~व्रतप्रतिष्ठाकालश्च पूर्वोक्तं “गुरोर्भृगोरस्त-

- 10 बाल्ये वार्द्धके सहिगे गुरौ” इत्यादिवचनेन गुरुशुक्रास्ताद्यशुद्ध समय एव कालः । तत्र

सर्वषष्ठेषु कर्तव्या प्रतिष्ठा विधिना बुधैः ।

फलार्थिभिस्त्वप्रतिष्ठं यस्मान्निष्फलमुच्यते ॥

इति ह्यशरीर्षपाश्वरात्रीयवचनेऽकरणे निष्फलत्वश्रुतेः प्रतिष्ठा नित्या । सा च न व्रताङ्गं,
किं तु प्रधानं कर्मान्तरम् ।

- 15 समाप्ते तु व्रते तत्र प्रतिष्ठा तदनन्तरम्

इति ब्रह्मपुराणात् । इत्थं च तद्दिनेऽशौचादौ यथा न तस्यानुष्ठानं तथा समयाशुद्धावपि
नानुष्ठानम् । यत्तु

समाप्ते तु व्रते तत्र प्रतिष्ठा तदनन्तरम् ।

न कालनियमस्तत्र तत्र विघ्ने पराब्धिके ॥

- 20 इति तत्पूर्णादिवसे समयाशुद्धावपि प्रतिष्ठाविधायकं वचनं तत् कामधेनुकल्पतरुकारादिभिर्-
लिखितत्वादानाकरम् । यद्व्रतं मासवर्षादिकालविशेषनियन्तितं काम्यं तस्यैव प्रतिष्ठा, यत्
पुनरित्यं कालविशेषनियन्तितं च न तस्य प्रतिष्ठा, पूर्वोक्तह्यशरीर्षे फलार्थिभिरित्यनेन
काम्यस्यैव प्रतिष्ठाविधानात् कालविशेषनियन्तितमित्येतदसम्भवाच्च । प्रतिष्ठाविधानं
च प्रतिष्ठाविवेकेऽनुसन्धेयम् ।

- 25 इति साङ्ख्यनमहामहोपाध्याय श्रीशूलपाणिविरचितो व्रतकालविवेकः समाप्तः ॥

Lines 13 *Hayasirṣapañcarātra*—a वैष्णव work concerned with the
consecration of images of gods and building temples.

„ 20 *Kalpataṛu*—Written by Lakṣmidhara. It exercised great
influence over the early smṛti writers of
Bengal and Mithilā. No complete ms. of the
work found.

„ 21 Bet. अनाकरं and यद्व्रतं B inserts अलेदमवधेयं A, B कार्यं for काम्यं

Verses quoted in Sūlapāṇi's Vratakālaviveka

Verse	Context
अभुक्त्वा प्रातराहारं	Devala
अष्टौ तान्यव्रतघ्नानि	Baudhāyana
अहःसु तिथयः पुरयाः	Jāvāla
अष्टमी रोहिणीयुक्ता	Vasiṣṭha
अष्टम्यामथ रोहिण्यां	Brahmavaivartapurāṇa
अष्टाब्दादधिको	Smṛti (?)
अर्धरात्रादधश्चोर्ध्वं	Isānasamhitā
आदित्यं गणनाथं च	Padmapurāṇa
आरब्धे तु व्रते	Vasiṣṭha
आदित्येऽहनि	Brahmapurāṇa
आदित्योदयवेलायाः	Sauradharmā
इति विज्ञाय कुर्वीत	Brahmavaivartapurāṇa
उपवासः प्रणश्येत	Devala
उदये तूपवासस्य	Baudhāyana
उपोषितव्यं नक्षत्रं	Viṣṇudharmottara
उपोष्य जन्मचिह्नानि	Nārada
उभयोः पक्षयोः	Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
एकादशी द्वादशीमिश्रा	Smṛti(?)
एकादशीमुपवसेत्	Kūrmapurāṇa
एकादशी दशविद्धां	Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
एकादश्यां प्रकुर्वन्ति	..
कृष्णपक्षेऽष्टमी	Nigama (?)
गरुडक्या उत्तरे तीरे	Jyotiḥkaumudī
गर्भिणी सूतिका नक्षत्रं	Matsyapurāṇa
गात्राभ्यङ्गं शिरोऽभ्यङ्गं	Mitākṣarā
गुरुर्गोरस्तबालये	Jyotiṣaṇ (?)
गृहीत्वौडम्बरं पालं	Mahābhārata
चतुर्दश्यमावास्या	Jyotiṣa
चैतशुक्ला तु	Āpastamba
ज्यैष्ठे शुक्लदशम्यां	Vyāsa
तद्वयानं तच्चपथैव	Devīpurāṇa

तथा शुक्लचतुर्दश्यां	Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
तिथिनक्षत्रसंयोगे	Nārada
तिथ्यन्ते चोत्सवान्ते	Garuḍapurāṇa
तिथीनामेव सर्वासां	?
लिसन्ध्याव्यापिनी या तु	Parāśara
त्रयोदश्यां यदा रात्रौ	Sivapurāṇa
दशमीशेषसंयुक्ता	Garuḍapurāṇa
दिवारात्रौ व्रतं यच्च	Padmapurāṇa
दिवाभागे त्रयोदश्यां	Nārada
देवमभ्यर्च्य पुष्पैश्च	Viṣṇudharmottara
दैवकृत्यं तु पूर्वाह्णे	Narasimhapurāṇa
द्वादश्याः प्रथमः	Viṣṇudharmottara
ध्यायेन्नारायणं	Yājñavalkya
नवग्रहमुखं	Matsyapurāṇa
न षष्ठीसमेता	Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
न करोति यदा	Skandapurāṇa
न स्नानेन न वस्त्रेण	?
नास्ति स्त्रीणां पृथक्	Manu
नित्यमेतद्व्रतं	Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
पतङ्गे मकरे याते	Rājamārtanḍa
पञ्चदश्यां तथा	Bhaviṣyottara
पुनः प्रभातसमये	Garuḍapurāṇa
पूर्णाप्येकादशी	Pracetas
प्रदोषव्यापिनी ग्राह्या	Smṛti(?)
प्रातः संकल्पयेद्विद्वान्	Varāhapurāṇa
बहिर्ग्रामान्त्यजां	Kūrmapurāṇa
वर्षे वर्षे	Padmapurāṇa
वासरे वा निशायां	Vaśiṣṭha
वृश्चिकस्य तु संक्रान्त्यां	Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
व्रतयज्ञविवाहेषु	Viṣṇu
ब्रह्माण्डोदरमध्ये तु	Skandapurāṇa
भाद्रमासि सिते	Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
महतामपि पापानां	?
माघमासस्य शेषे	Nāgarakhaṇḍa
माघे कृष्णचतुर्दश्यां	Īśānasamhitā
मासे मलिम्लुचे	Viṣṇurahasya

मीने धनुषि	Smṛti (?)
सुदृढं द्वादशी	Kūmapurāṇa
यथा शुक्ला तथा	Smṛti (?)
यो गृहीत्वा	Chāgaleya
रम्भाख्यां वर्जयित्वा	Brahmavaivarta
रोहिणीसहिता कृष्णा	Skandapurāṇa
लोभात् मोहात्	Sāmbapurāṇa (acc. to some Padmapurāṇa)
शयनीबोधनीमध्ये	Brahmavaivartapurāṇa
शिवा घोरा	Jyotiṣa
श्रावणी दौर्गन्धमी	Bṛhaspati
षष्ठ्यां चैककृताहारः	Varāhapurāṇa
सर्वमङ्गलमङ्गल्यं वरेण्यं	„
सर्वभूतभयं	Devala
सप्तमोसहिताष्टम्यां	Brahmavaivarta
सर्वेष्वृक्केषु कर्तव्या	Hayasīrṣapañcarātra
समाप्ते तु व्रते	Brahmapurāṇa
संकल्पमूलः कामो	Manu
सावित्रीयं मया दत्ता	?
सायंकाले समारोप्य	Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
सिंहार्के रोहिणीयुक्ता	Varāhasaṃhitā



